THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his remarkable book, *A Plain Man's Life of Christ*, the Rev. A. D. Martin has a chapter on the Sermon on the Mount in which he says some interesting things about the main ideas in the teaching of Jesus. But, first of all, he points out that the Sermon on the Mount is not a sermon at all, but a collection of sayings, made by some ardent disciple who desired to provide his fellow-believers with a sort of Christian handbook for the conduct of the devout life. As Professor E. F. Scott says: 'It is hardly conceivable that Jesus regularly spoke in pointed maxims, one succeeding another without a break.'

The Sermon is a manual of sayings arranged by a believer and meant only for believers. The failure to recognize the esoteric character of the Sermon is the cause of the pathetic fallacy of modern Christendom—the expectation that under its appeal a 'brave new world' will emerge from our wars and confusions without any radical change in the hearts of men. This fallacy is repeated once and again in history, in the Holy Alliance after Waterloo and in the League of Nations after the last war. Both collapsed because they were not operated by men who had definitely accepted the Cross as the gate of life.

People say: 'If only men would obey the Sermon on the Mount all would be well with mankind,' forgetful that the Sermon goes much deeper than the ordering of outward life. It mostly refers, not to our relations with men, but to our relations with God. It examines our states of heart and our secret loyalties. It recommends humble dependence on God. And it points to a final reckoning. It is true that if men obeyed the Sermon on the Mount all would be well, but it must be remembered that the Sermon calls for such practices of the inner life as alone make Christian conduct possible.

When we think, then, of the *doctrine* of the Sermon we are struck by one term that occurs in several forms and seems to indicate a governing conception—'Your Father which is in heaven.' It is of the first importance that we should understand its significance. Very naturally in our Western way we interpret the Divine Fatherhood biologically, and so derive therefrom the comfortable conception of human nature as essentially good, and then conclude that all men are naturally brothers. But the Hebrew did not think of God and man biologically. Neither did Jesus.

In the Old Testament the Divine Fatherhood is never asserted of all mankind, but only of Israel, and of Israel only by an act of adoption. God's Fatherhood over Israel was manifested in His father-like actions. And Jesus spoke of God and man in the same way. 'Your Father in heaven' was an expression frequently on His lips. But 'children of God' as a collective address, never. It was possible for men to become sons of Another. Father and Son in the teaching of Jesus, as in Biblical and rabbinic teaching generally, were moral metaphors not biological terms.

People have often found biological assertion in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. But this, Mr.

MARTIN says, is a misinterpretation. As Jesus told the tale the prodigal's confession, 'I have sinned against heaven and before thee,' draws a distinction between God and the father of the boy. The story is in fact a beautiful defence of Jesus in His treatment of publicans and sinners by a characteristic appeal to what a humane and gracious father would do with a repentant son. It is a defence of the saviourhood of Jesus against the criticism, 'this man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them,' not a proclamation of the Fatherhood of God. As the father had inalienable rights in his son, and therefore rejoiced in their re-establishment, so Jesus had rights in sinful men, and welcomed with festive joy the hour when they drew near to hear Him.

Further, similarly, the pleasing notions we commonly hold of man's essential goodness and of a universal human brotherhood, whether true or not, do not belong to the gospel. Actually Jesus once addressed even His beloved Apostles in the words, 'ye being evil.' For whether they were children of God or not depended on the individual attitude of each, and in any case did not obliterate at once a fundamental tendency to evil. Men might *become* children of God or children of the Devil. In the same way brotherhood might well be the relationship of those who, by making the same individual response of obedience and faith, came into the family of God as sons, but it could only be used in a diluted sense of the relations of natural men. Jesus never used it of mankind at large. The Scriptures inspired by Him take the same position.

The exhortations, 'Honour all men, love the brotherhood,' mark the difference between ordinary human fellowship and the much more vital communion of those who share the same religious beliefs. In this restriction of the term 'brother' the early Christians were wise. The diluting of good metaphor to cover heterogeneous collections is a sign of slovenly thinking. It savours of cant to talk of the brotherhood of mankind when we have no intention of implementing the phrase by such deeds of kindness as we would show to the children of our own parents.

There is still another point to be noted in the teaching of the Sermon. It is to be found in the Lord's Prayer, and has been insufficiently regarded by most expositors—the regal character of the Divine Father. In modern family life a father seldom rules his children. He is their companion, their chum, and often wonderfully good natured. This may be an improvement on older customs. But, whether or not, it must not be allowed to mislead us in our interpretation of the Fatherhood of God, as Jesus saw it. For in Oriental, and especially in ancient Jewish, life, fatherhood always had a sovereign function. And so when the model prayer speaks of God as Father it is to seek first the hallowing, rather than the endearing, of His name, and then the coming of His authority over men's lives. And it is only after such thoughts and agreements have been expressed in their prayers that Christians may fitly speak of their own personal need.

Jesus was an austere teacher, but His austerity is singularly congruous with unevadable moral facts. For Jesus, the human situation could not be ameliorated by anything but drastic methods. At the same time, if men were willing to pay the price, to 'count the cost,' the resultant gain would be a heaven of infinite blessing. He knew that the centre of all effective blessing must be God in His holiness, not man in his better moments. The rights of holiness are supreme, but they are based on the reality of God's energizing, communicating and all-wise life—that life which in varying measure moves every star and every soul.

Dr. James MOFFATT, in his recent work, *Jesus Christ the Same* (reviewed in our columns last month), discusses the idea of the imitation of Christ. It was, as he says, from the very outset part of the significance of Jesus that He could be, and was regarded as, a pattern for His followers. This aspect of His significance he discusses chiefly as it is set forth in the New Testament, yet not without some glances at later periods.

The first three Gospels do not, in so many words, represent Jesus as calling for imitation of Himself on the part of His inner circle of adherents. It is not to copy but to follow Him that the summons is, though the one means the other. But there are two writings of the New Testament in which the life of Jesus on earth is explicitly recognized as an example to copy.

The Fourth Gospel gives us a picture of His humility in action, and represents Him as leaving a rule to be obeyed. It is when after the feet-washing He says to the disciples: 'I have given you an example that you should do as I have done to you'; and again, 'as I have loved you, so you are to love one another.'

Again, the Epistle to the Hebrews contains a similar representation. There, Jesus is portrayed as the 'pioneer and perfection of faith' on whom we are to fix our eyes. It is not that He inspires faith in His followers, but that He gives a lead to our faith such as no other can give. In enduring the Cross He is a living example of human faithfulness.

Sometimes in the course of the history of the Church the example of Jesus was taken literally, as when Polycarp 'waited to be betrayed, as the Lord had waited.' More frequently, it was taken in a general sense, as when Thomas à Kempis interpreted the duty of the Christian not so much as outward imitation of Christ as devout obedience to His Spirit.

It is interesting to notice that, just as for rabbinic Judaism holiness sometimes amounted practically to the imitation of God in the sense of reproducing such qualities as mercy and loving-kindness, so it was frequently for early Christianity. The Divine character was put forward as a model for active, affectionate behaviour in the Church, in accordance with the Lord's precept: 'Be perfect as the heavenly Father is perfect.' But on the whole the imitation of God soon included Jesus Christ.

'Nowadays the usage has come to be different. The Divine qualities of tenderness and pity are associated as a rule with what is Christlike. "Godlike" denotes moral or mental excellence, and is generally associated with strong, upright character of exceptionally high rank; we are more apt to think of Christlike forgiveness and of Godlike dignity or power. Shakespeare and Coleridge have taught us to talk about godlike reason, whereas in the first early centuries of the Faith "godlike" would have covered not merely the faculty of reason but more often the life that gives freely and forgives.' An example is quoted from the Epistle to Diognetus.

The point is specially stressed in the discussion that when St. Paul appeals to the example of Christ, it is not only to the obedience of His humility in the Incarnation but also to the obedience and self-sacrifice of the Incarnate Life. Indeed it was the impression of the Lord's actual life that put new colour into such 'cloudy notions' as those of the Son of Man and the Messiah. The appeal of St. Paul, as of St. Peter 'or a later writer' and of St. John or a writer 'belonging to the Johannine circle' (who like St. Paul hold up the example of Jesus), implies, if not personal reminiscences, at any rate reminiscences of a person.

Dr. MOFFATT insists that any adoration or any admiration which fails to include the imitation of Jesus is out of line with the conception of His example in historical Christianity. So is also any imitation of Jesus which fails to include adoration and admiration. He was more than the supreme illustration of what man may be or do. He was more than an example. He is Christ, and we are Christians. But if His revelation of God is to be realized, it must include some reproduction of the Divine character which He embodied.

In pointing out that the imitation of Jesus has a clear place in the early Christian ethic, Dr. MOFFATT is seeking to support the early tradition on the question of the real Divine humanity of Jesus. The Divine humanity was veiled or obscured under the formulas of Nicaea and Chalcedon, and the tendency to withhold from it its due recognition has passed down the centuries.

In this machine age of ours mechanistic theories have naturally had a big innings. 'Give us machinery in greater abundance,' they have cried, 'newer and more perfect machinery, and human well-being will be automatically secured.'

It is natural, therefore, that modern man should see in the universe around him the most impressive example of a machine, an automatic, self-generating, self-operating machine. But now that all the world has been rudely awakened to the fact that man from being the slave of the machine has at last become its mangled victim, we may reasonably anticipate that there will be a growing conviction that machinery is not everything, and that a mechanistic explanation of the cosmos is wholly unsatisfying.

A book which should do considerable service along this line is *Christianity and the Mechanists*, by Mr. W. Osborne GREENWOOD, M.D., B.S., F.R.S.E. (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 9s. net). It is written by a well-informed and competent scientist who is familiar with the most recent findings in the various branches of science, especially the biological, and who has done some fresh thinking of his own. He does not write for the specialist, but keeps the plain man in view throughout, tries to instruct him in the facts of the case, appeals to

him to take a common-sense view of them and base his world-view upon that.

Dr. GREENWOOD deals only very briefly with the physical sciences because, as he rightly says, there is now little support given to mechanistic theories by these sciences. This is a fact which needs to be reiterated till it is driven home to the public mind. There was a time when the mechanist firmly rested his faith on the solid and indestructible atom, and it was considered rank heresy when Clerk Maxwell ventured to suggest that the atom bore all the marks of a manufactured article. Now the turn of the wheel is complete, the solid atom is an exploded myth, and the highest authorities in physical science—Jeans and Eddington in this country and Millikan in America—emphatically declare their belief that 'the so-called material universe is certainly immaterial in its last analysis and convincingly suggests that its real basis is spirituality.'

It is in the biological sciences, curiously enough, that mechanism now makes its most determined stand. It is strange that it should seem to have wholly escaped the notice of mechanistic biologists that, even supposing they were to succeed in proving that all the actions of living creatures are purely mechanical, they would still have to deal with the problem of the atomic structure of these living creatures before they could claim to have reached a final analysis. And the moment they enter the world of atoms they find absolutely nothing mechanical there.

Dr. GREENWOOD, however, takes the biologists on their own ground. It is difficult for people with ordinary common sense to have patience with the purblind specialist who solemnly tries to prove that there is no fundamental difference between the living and the dead. Dr. GREENWOOD goes over the ground with patience and insight, and he has many penetrating criticisms to make. He calls attention to the unique qualities of carbon, the chemical essential of life, qualities which make carbon 'a glaring incongruity in the otherwise orderly sequence of the elements.' He deals with the biologist's unity, the cell; he considers how life may have been generated, how it is continued, and what life really means. Beyond that he treats of the growing complexity in organisms, of instinct, of the nervous system, and finally of the emergence of mind and personality. It is difficult to follow the argument without finally agreeing with the conclusion that 'everything we know about such possibilities negatives the whole imaginative picture *unless we grant* that some directive Mind had schemed the whole course of events, and in His own way brought a seemingly hopeless confusion and chaos to a fruition which appeared upon the face of it to be impossible.'

Some interesting points are dealt with touching the possibility of miracles, and particularly the Virgin Birth. But passing from these a word may be said about the complete absorption of biologists in seeking for mechanical explanations. Their action is readily understandable when their point of view is appreciated. Laplace told the Emperor Napoleon that he had no need of the hypothesis of a Creator in his work as an astronomer, and in a sense that was perfectly true. An astronomer may trace out with precision all the motions of the stars and planets without raising the question of a Creator. If he raises that question he does so as a philosopher, not as a pure astronomer. In like manner the biologist's subject of study is the movements, habits, instincts, actions and reactions of the bodies of living things, and his business is to analyse the mechanical agencies and linkages by means of which life and action become possible. This work can be perfectly well done, and is perhaps better done, without raising ultimate problems of ontology and teleology, so long as it is clearly kept in view that biology does not give the final explanation of things.

Biologists, it is to be feared, sometimes forget this, and, like other specialists, regard their findings as subject to no modification or higher review. The general public is thus very naturally misled, just as it was when it mistook Darwin's theory of evolution for a substitute for creation, although Darwin expressly took up his work at a point where there was already a world in existence with living creatures in it. Which things remind us that the bias of the will more than the weight of the evidence is decisive in belief and unbelief. So the mechanistic scientist, far from being as he fondly pictures himself a pure searcher for truth, will readily accept a favourable supposition, and base his theory on a hundred-millionth chance, while the whole universe is crying aloud for the recognition of intelligent purpose.

Reconstruction Problems.

IV. A Challenge that must be Faced.

By the Reverend R. J. Wedderspoon, M.A., Pollokshields, Glasgow.

War brings many unpleasant surprises, and this war is no exception to the rule. We have had our full share of unpleasant surprises, and in nearly every case they have been caused by the fact that we habitually underestimate the enemy's power and skill. 'It could never happen,' we have glibly said, and then, rather ruefully, we have seen it come to pass.

In our planning for the days after the war it might be well for us if we applied the hard lesson this war-time experience teaches. What is to be the attitude of the nation to the Christian religion after the war? How will the State, acting through Parliament, declare itself with regard to issues vitally affecting the Christian Churches? These are not easy questions to answer, and this article is written to suggest that it might be wise policy to prepare ourselves now for possible unpleasant surprises. 'Men of vision cannot fail to see that humanity is passing at this moment through the fire of social revolution as well as of universal war, and that the world which will emerge from the ordeal will in many respects think and believe and act very differently from the world of the past.' That is a passage from a recent *Times* leader (29th December 1941), and its operative word for us is 'believe.'

So far as the State's declaring itself is concerned, the proposals recently put forward to the President of the Board of Education by the Anglican and Free Churches acting in unison seem to present a test case. The question at issue is that of Christian education in schools. Shall Parliament be willing to pass the legislation that is necessary to give effect to the united and considered demands of the Churches? It should be noted that the Churches, Anglican and Free, have united in their proposals for the first time. While this matter refers immediately to England and Wales, and not to Scotland, the decision which is arrived at is bound to influence future Scottish legislation as well. In Scotland the present position is that religious instruction in non-Roman schools *may* be given, according to 'use and wont.' There is no specific injunction that it *must* be given.

On 16th August 1941 the President of the Board of Education, Mr. Butler, received the strong deputation, headed by the Archbishops, which put forward the proposals. He expressed 'complete sympathy' with their object, but he did not promise immediately to act upon them. He hoped 'that when the time came for legislation it would include a provision on the lines which the deputation desired.' Subsequent debate in the House of Commons on 19th November 1941 showed that, according to the Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Chuter Ede, legislation would be necessary on four points if the Churches' requests were to be met. 'These were: the statutory requirement that religious instruction should be given; a daily act of worship to be included in every school; removal of the limitation of the hours during which religious instruction might be given; and the employment of His Majesty's Inspectors on the inspection of religious instruction.'

There meanwhile the matter rests. It is hardly necessary to recapitulate the reasons which have led the Churches to such cordial unanimity. They have been widely canvassed, and should be known to all. The dominant question is: How will Parliament meet the proposals? I have called this a test case, because it raises in a clearly defined form, and focuses, an issue of very great importance. The decision eventually reached is bound to give us some indication of the nation's attitude to the Christian faith, and, more specifically, to the teaching of Christian doctrine.

Now it is just possible that we may get an unpleasant surprise, for we are apt to assume too airily that what the Churches unanimously agree upon they can effectively secure by legislation. We may discover that the 'simple ethics' of Jesus will be approved for teaching purposes, but what is called 'dogmatic teaching' will be frowned upon, Christian dogma being considered thoroughly suspect. There are some grounds at least for thinking that this attitude of mind is widespread throughout the nation. The Headmaster of Rugby may declare that 'no religious education is possible without a doctrinal foundation,' and Miss Dorothy Sayers may state that 'a religion without theology and without relation to secular thought is apt to become a spiritual chimæra bombinating in a mental vacuum.' No matter! The atmosphere of to-day is against all tight and specific formulation in doctrinal, theological terms.

It is not surprising that the Rationalist Press Association should immediately declare itself in opposition to the Church proposals. The proposals are 'reactionary, undemocratic, and calculated to revive sectarian divisions among parents, teachers, and children' (Letter to the Board of Education, September 1941). This opposition was only to be expected, and it need not be taken too seriously. The R.P.A. always runs true to form! The difficulty that the Churches are up against may be better indicated by a brief description of some signs and portents that suggest an increasing dissatisfaction with the orthodox Christian point of view. It is possible to overrate the importance of these signs, it is true, but it would be extreme folly to ignore them.

First, we may detect an increasing vigour of attack by responsible persons, not only against the Churches, but against the Churches' faith. The attack is more often 'pressed home with determination.' We have long been familiar with the book that provides the up-to-date version of what is wrong with the Church. It is a poor season if we do not get one at least per month. Our backs become inured to chastisement with whips, and we discover that we can even stand up to chastisement with scorpions. Written in petulant mood, often ill-natured, these volumes are in many cases not worth serious and considered reply. They are hammers being broken on the anvil.

But recently there has been a much more responsible and instructed criticism, and occasionally it has come from unexpected quarters. In April 1939, for instance, there appeared in the quarterly journal, *Philosophy*, an article by a leading philosopher, Professor C. D. Broad of Cambridge, that astonished by the sustained virulence and even malevolence of its attack on the whole Christian position. He boldly asserts that he has now 'disposed of all the alleged grounds for accepting specifically Christian doctrines by the use of quite simple arguments, without needing to appeal to modern science at all.' He talks of 'the mind-destroying hocus-pocus of theology,' and of its 'mysterious and apparently nonsensical verbiage.' On the question of human survival after death he declares that there are but 'a few pinches of philosophical fluff' (whatever that may be!) to put on the scale over against the vast coherent mass of ascertained biological and physiological facts. He can even allow himself to say that it would be 'merely impudent' to suggest that the direct evidence for the resurrection of Christ is comparable in weight with that for the 'super-normal physical phenomena of D. D. Home.' And so on.

Now the importance of this outburst, which, incidentally, attracted far less attention than might have been expected, lies in the fact that a Cambridge philosopher should dare to write in such terms. Gone is the old respect for an august and venerable tradition which could only be laid aside with sorrow and deep searching of heart. Rather the attitude is, Let us sweep away this entangling and impeding superstition. The atmosphere has changed, and, as this article suggests, an unaccustomed violence is introduced where formerly there was grave and majestic debate worthy of the magnitude of the theme.

Further evidence comes from the writings of Professor Joad, and his point of view is important because he possesses the enviable gift of popularization, and because his Brains Trust B.B.C. position endows him with a vast power of influence. 'Why has the Church lost its hold? There can be only one answer: because it no longer teaches a creed that fulfils the spiritual needs of contemporary man' (*New Statesman*, 24th January 1940). Joad is always good-natured, and he never quite despairs of the Church. Indeed he says in his book, *What is at stake, and why not say so?* (p. 42), that democracy can only survive if it can succeed in calling religion to its aid. 'In what direction is it to look for its religious ally, if it is not to Christianity? It may be, of course, observed that the Christianity to which I am appealing no longer exists, that it is a dead religion, or so near its death that it cannot revive and again become a living faith to quicken the heart of man. I do not believe this. I believe that Christianity can still re-create the spirit of its original impulse: but to do so, it must again become a revolutionary faith. It is as a revolutionary faith that it must be presented to the modern generation, not as a spiritual bath-chair in which a decadent age wheels about its sick conscience.' It is clear enough, however, that for him doctrinal Christianity, as at present understood, must go. Incarnation and atonement are meaningless terms. The language of the Church is outmoded.

Then there is always Mr. H. G. Wells, whose bitterness has certainly not diminished, and who never misses an opportunity of jeering at the Christian faith and its modern upholders. His reference, for example, to 'praying generals' will not soon be forgotten. Convinced Christians, sure of their own position, are not at all perturbed by the repeated attacks made by Mr. Wells, but the point to bear in mind is that he has exercised, and continues to exercise, what can only be called a baleful influence over the young and impressionable. 'Why do people go on pretending about this Christianity? At the test of war, disease, social injustice, and every real human distress it fails, and leaves a cheated victim as it abandoned

my mother. Jesus was some fine sort of man perhaps, the Jewish Messiah was a promise of leadership, but our Saviour of the Trinity is a dressed-up, inconsistent effigy of amiability, a monstrous hybrid of man and infinity, making vague promises of helpful miracles for the cheating of simple souls, an ever absent help in time of trouble' (*Experiment in Autobiography*, i. 68). 'Christianity is a silly story' (p. 67). All his works are strewn with the same kind of taunts and scoffings. He is always marching in what Denney called 'the foremost files of time,' and leading a reluctant world to a Wellsian paradise that is to many singularly bleak. Meanwhile the harm goes on. The atmosphere is drenched with a pestilential vapour, and not all find the secret of decontamination.

Secondly, there is to be considered the effect that is produced by the utterances of those who may themselves belong to the household of Faith, but are increasingly critical of the Church and its attitude. When Sidney Dark, for example, summarizing his experience as editor of the *Church Times*, tells us that he found it difficult to get many of his readers interested in matters of vital social concern, because their whole attention was absorbed by the minutiæ of ecclesiasticism, he is speaking as one who is a believer, a 'practising' Christian, but the effect of this utterance is to suggest doubt as to whether this alleged absorption in the details of subsidiary doctrine and in the externals of worship is wholesome. The impression that is given, rightly or wrongly, is that the Churches concentrate on the things that matter little to the exclusion of the things that do matter, and their influence once again is subtly diminished. It must be confessed that the result of the work of many who have endeavoured to be the Church's defenders is that they have only added a fresh impetus to the movement that seeks to denude the Church of all authority.

Next we turn to a thinker who commands our wholehearted respect, Professor John Macmurray. In a brilliantly written booklet of sixty-three pages, *A Challenge to the Churches* (1941), Professor Macmurray states: 'The condition which contemporary Christianity must fulfil is this: it must cease to function as a conservative religion. It must reassert in action, and not merely in words, its own essence as a creative religion. It must function as the religion of the new community which is struggling to be born' (p. 61). 'On the side of doctrine and theology it must exchange the conservative spirit of Mediæval Scholasticism—which is the spirit of dogmatic tradition—for the creative spirit of modern science. . . . The traditional theology, with its guaranteed certainties, its traditional revelations, its *a priori* logical argumentations is essentially the product of pagan philosophy' (p. 62).

Here again is a plea for a revolutionary religion, and here again as a first step it is demanded that the traditional doctrine must be shed. There is delightful vagueness as to which doctrine or doctrines must be jettisoned or recast, and one feels that it is at this point the argument is weakest. But, manifestly, powerful forces are at work for the disintegration of the accepted Christian system of belief, and one may be pardoned for sometimes wondering what organic relation the new revolutionary, all-conquering religion of the future, when it emerges, will have to the faith once delivered to the saints. Will Christ, Crucified and Risen, for us men and our salvation, still be at the heart of it? Or shall our quaint belief in Him as the Lord of Life and Death form a subject for post-graduate research to the 'illuminati' of succeeding ages?

Thirdly, a sign of the times worthy of note is the emergence of the New Mysticism, as expounded by Gerald Heard and that most lucid of all writers, Aldous Huxley. It might seem that this is hardly worthy of mention in that its appeal is bound to be only to select souls. Shrewd judges have declared, however, that it may spread with great rapidity. It has a definite technique, it links up with the great mystics of history, and it is definitely theocentric. The influence of the mystics upon Huxley himself has been profound. In all his recent books one has been able to trace the increasing influence of mysticism, while in his most recent book, *Grey Eminence* (1941), he gives us a biography of Father Joseph, the 'Foreign Secretary' of Cardinal Richelieu, who was mystic and practical politician both. The character of Father Joseph is obviously of great attraction to Huxley, and much of the book is devoted to the discussion of mysticism. Huxley is for the Dionysian tradition, as opposed to that of Benet of Canfield, whom Father Joseph followed. 'To a non-Christian, this seems the supremely important, the eminently encouraging fact about mysticism—that it provides the basis for a religion free from unacceptable dogmas, which themselves are contingent upon ill-established and arbitrarily interpreted historical facts' (p. 77). Again we see the revulsion from doctrine, and it is typical of our modern world that we should discover this aversion to Christian doctrine expressing itself in so many different ways.

While these signs and portents of our times I have tried to discuss must necessarily be considered in relation to the other tendencies and desires of our age, enough has at any rate been suggested to show that we may not expect overwhelming national support for the teaching in

State-aided schools of the traditional doctrines of the Christian religion. It is well that we should recognize this fact, and even now take more definite steps to meet the situation which is clearly emerging.

There seem to be two points that demand immediate attention.

1. There is an urgent necessity that the Churches should formulate, clearly, and as simply as may be possible, what they, acting in unison, believe the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith to be. As matters stand, it is not a difficult matter for opponents of anything that comes within range of dogmatic teaching to point to the different emphasis that is found as between one Church and another. Is it not possible to concentrate upon the minimum of essential teaching that all could whole-heartedly support? Canon Cockin of St. Paul's has pointed out that this is the next step the Churches ought to take, and that, if it were taken, it would greatly strengthen the force of the Churches' demands for legislative reform. In view of the situation which is facing us now, and whose difficulties will be accentuated at the end of the war, how long can any Church afford to dwell in isolation, holding out for the recognition of this or that eagerly cherished doctrine or belief? We must separate the essentials from the excrescences, and we must do it now. War-time demands a quickened tempo in Church circles as well as in governmental ones.

2. There ought also to be the provision of ample supplies of cheap apologetic literature. The feeling grows that the Church is not 'getting its case across' to the general public. We know that it is always easy to be destructive, and the weaknesses of the Church provide a target, we readily ourselves confess, that only sheer ineptitude could miss. But, in spite of all weaknesses and failures, there is a strength, a power of resilience in the Church that might be more convincingly displayed to the popular mind than it often is. That the doctrines of the Church cannot be so airily disposed of as some builders of the new world imagine, that the Church has its own impressive claims to make for its services to education and social reform in the past, that the dynamic the Christian religion affords will alone be sufficient to provide and equip worthy citizens for a new world—these are facts which should be broadcast by every available means in a form calculated to catch the attention of the uninstructed and the otherwise indifferent. We have powerful minds at work producing volumes that can stand comparison with the most distinguished writing of our generation. One has only to mention William Temple, John Baillie, H. H. Farmer, C. H. Dodd, Vincent Taylor, C. E. Raven, A. E. Taylor, and J. S. Whale, naming only a few, to make it evident that we have a wealth of disciplined scholarship and consecrated intellectual power at our command. Surely it is not impossible that the teaching these and others provide should be imparted even in pamphlet form, so that the mass of the people may find means of defence against the barrage of faith-destroying activities which every year seems to intensify.

The great debate is on. It has always been on, but now it reaches a new level of intensity. And as we brace ourselves for it, about whatever immediate issue it may be concerned, it might be well if we imprinted afresh on our minds the words of the great Dean Church in his famous sermon on 'Responsibility for Our Belief': 'Do not let us be content with loose thinking and assuming that the enemies of Christianity have probably made out their case. For I venture to say that Christianity, if not true, is the most extraordinary thing in the world; really much more extraordinary than if it *is* true. I repeat, this world of our experience is ten times more strange and puzzling than it is now, if Christianity is not true. And if we are to lose it—to lose Him whom the modern world has hitherto looked to for its ideal and leaned on for its support, if the new world before us is to be one without the Cross, or God, or immortality, let us know what we are about; let us have the seriousness which befits the surrender of such a hope, the seriousness with which a vanquished State surrenders territory or independence to the necessities of defeat, with which in the old strife of parties a beaten statesman surrendered his life and fate to the law.'

Literature.

ISAIAH.

All who are interested in Biblical studies will welcome the first volume of Professor Edward J. Kissane's commentary on Isaiah—*The Book of Isaiah*, vol. i. (i.–xxxix.) (Browne & Nolan; 21s. net). It follows the same lines as his 'Job.' In a general introduction the background of Isaiah's work is described, his message summarized, and critical questions are discussed. Each of the six main sections of the book (except the last) is treated as a group of poems of some length. In

every case a brief critical introduction is followed by an original translation, often suggestive and sometimes brilliant, and a more detailed comment. Dr. Kissane tends to be conservative, protesting against the tendency to throw much of the material in the book into a late period, and deprecating the amount of textual emendation sometimes made *metri gratia*. He does not, however, appear to realize that the newer criticism is not a 'fragment' hypothesis, but a theory of the collection of short utterances, mostly complete, and often skilfully put together—a very different thing from a disordered accumulation of 'fragments.' Nor does he appear to realize that in its modern form metrical theory demands comparatively few conjectural emendations, though often supported by the ancient versions; he has not, for example, grasped the fact that '3+2' is nearly always combined with '2+2' as a regular variation. (In general, his work might have been even better if he had given more consideration to other parts of the Old Testament.) He suffers most, however, from the adoption of a strophic theory, which can surely be applied but seldom to prophetic poetry. Here it may be noted that his views lead to a good deal of modification in the text; there is hardly a poem which is free from excisions or transpositions. An impartial reader may well ask whether this is not as reprehensible as the introduction of emendations made purely *metri gratia*. Occasionally, too, Dr. Kissane has to resort to conjectural emendation to maintain the Isaianic authorship of a poem. These, however, are blemishes (if that be the right word) of a kind to which the work of almost any serious Biblical student is liable, and the whole of this valuable book is marked by the qualities we have been taught to expect from its author—conscientious study of the text, freedom of thought and treatment, deep and extensive learning, and a genuine desire to transmit to his readers the spiritual message of the prophet. T. H. Robinson.

A NEW (AND BETTER) LIFE OF CHRIST.

'Perhaps the best season for such an effort is when one has reached the Delectable Mountains, for then views are possible, not only towards the Celestial City in which Jesus so certainly believed, but also back over that ancient history in which His life was so truly rooted.' These are moving words; for their writer, the Rev. A. D. Martin, had reached the Delectable Mountains when he wrote them, and before they were printed had himself been received into the Celestial City. Perhaps it was because his vision was so clear that he has left us so precious a gift as this book, *A Plain Man's Life of Christ* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). There is a mellow wisdom about it which, allied to rigorous scholarship and as rigorous a conscience, has produced one of the most fascinating and revealing accounts of the ministry of Jesus that I have read for many years. It constantly reminds one of Dr. Glover, and one can pay no higher compliment to it than that.

Mr. Martin keeps strictly to the framework supplied by St. Mark. Even when he is dealing with the Resurrection, where he might have been tempted to draw on other sources, he confines himself to the primitive Gospel tradition. And the result is that we find with some surprise how strong and definite the primitive evidence is. He deals there with two things, the empty tomb and the manifestations of Jesus; and in regard to the latter he brings out two points of great interest and value. The experience of those who saw Jesus after death had these characteristics: agitation and then a stabilized elevation, and both of these point to the reality of the manifestation. I mention this example of Mr. Martin's method to show both the restriction of his aim and the suggestiveness of his treatment.

The author's standpoint is an orthodox liberalism. His conclusions are for the most part positive and catholic, but he is not bound by any particular school or creed, and in some matters he departs pretty far from traditional scholarship. In writing of the Lord's Supper, for example, he says: 'There is no indication that Jesus intended His followers to repeat His symbolic acts.' I have never been able to understand how any one can come to such a conclusion in the face of Paul's definite assurance that his account of the Supper came from Jesus Himself, probably by way of Peter or James. But, though Mr. Martin is free in his treatment of his material, the whole trend of his writing and the definite impression he leaves on the reader are entirely reassuring. One could give many instances of this. But I prefer to say simply that here you will find the story of Jesus told with an engaging simplicity and with a knowledge that continually startles you with felicitous interpretations and disclosures, and finally with a reverence and love that set the Lord before us in all His grace and truth. F. J. Rae.

THE PENTATEUCH.

An interesting—perhaps remarkable—book has recently been published in Palestine by two Jewish scholars, D. and M. Gersham. It is written in Hebrew, and its title may be rendered *Ways in Biblical Criticism* (נתיבות בבקורת המקרא. דבורה ומהתיהו אבידב (גרשמן). *Tel-Aviv*). It deals, however, only with the Pentateuch, and even there is practically confined to the legal sections. The authors' standpoint is at once liberal and devout. The Graf-Wellhausen analysis of the Pentateuch is not expressly rejected, and appears to be assumed. Free use is made of other codes of law, emanating from the Ancient East, and their influence on Biblical law critically examined. The authors do not hesitate, where they think it desirable, to criticise Hebrew laws, and even to express a preference (as in matters relating to slavery) for those of other peoples.

At the close of a short introduction to the history of Pentateuchal criticism, it is observed that the analysis into J, E, D, and P (H is curiously omitted) does not necessarily determine the absolute dating of these collections. Pursuing this line of thought, the authors deal with the

reforms of Josiah and Ezra, reaching the conclusion that neither was associated with any of the codes as they have come down to us. In the former case they cite Welch's views with approval, and throw D back to the time of Samuel. A discussion of Chronicles, which is given a high historical value, leads to an account of the reforms of Jehoshaphat, with which P is to be connected. The authors then introduce the most interesting and important of their many suggestions. They believe that laws were preserved in different sanctuaries, and, instead of ascribing divergent or contradictory laws to different periods, they explain a number of differences by assuming that the laws emanated from various districts—a good example is to be found in the prescriptions for the Passover as found in Exodus and Deuteronomy. They even go so far as to assign laws which suggest a comparatively poor community, or one still on the nomad plane, to the sanctuary of Gilgal, which, they think, served the whole country to the east of the Jordan. At the same time, there are cases where one form of a law is later than another, especially where it is clear that a correction or deliberate modification is introduced. It is even possible that a few of the laws are directly influenced by the Code of Hammurabi.

The last two hundred and fifty pages of the book are devoted to a detailed discussion of the individual laws. They are grouped under two main heads—those which regulate the cultus, and those which affect civil life, while a short chapter is devoted to a discussion between the laws of Israel and those of the Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, and Hittites. Here, it must be confessed, the authors do not seem to appreciate the view normally held by critical scholars. They vigorously (and, on the whole, successfully) combat the theory that P was based on the Code of Hammurabi, and that therefore it must be not earlier than the Exile. But does any one hold that opinion to-day? A good deal of space is devoted to refuting the theories of Jirku (surely a superfluous task!), but little notice is taken of the one valid suggestion made by that scholar, namely, that in the 'Book of the Covenant' we have actually the most primitive form of the type of law generally current in the Ancient East. This means that it was probably accepted in Palestine a thousand years before the Israelite conquest, and was, presumably, taken over by the Aramaean invaders from their predecessors.

The book as a whole is stimulating and interesting, and is written with insight, freshness, and real scholarship. In controversial sections it is apt to be unconvincing; there is a good deal of special pleading, and we often meet with arguments like 'Would a man of this sort do things like this?' In dismissing the 'Redactor,' for instance, the functions the authors assign to a Redactor are described, and it is then pointed out that the text does not show that these functions have been adequately discharged. Hence there was no Redactor. At the same time, it may be pointed out that their whole theory depends on the work of Redactors—or a Redactor—who compiled the legal sections of the Pentateuch in their present form from the varied material at his (their) disposal. In the actual positive and constructive work, however, there is little to criticise and much to approve. It will be a pity if this book remains accessible only to that limited number of Bible students who can be reached through the medium of modern Hebrew.

T. H. Robinson.

There are thousands of people who, when they heard that Mr. W. J. Brown, General Secretary of the Civil Service Clerical Association, was to broadcast, made sure of being free to listen. For his words, his tone, his voice, are all ideally suited for propaganda. In *What Have I to Lose?* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net) Mr. Brown gives us the substance of his broadcasts. His book is intended to answer and counter false propaganda, and especially three false pleas—Revolutionary Defeatism, the Propaganda of Indifference, and the Propaganda of a Negotiated Peace. It is unnecessary to say to people who have listened to Mr. Brown that you have a sane and balanced statement here, put with power and conviction. And if any have not heard Mr. Brown, let them read him and profit by his wisdom.

The union of the three leading Wesleyan bodies in America was an event of wide significance. Bishop Paul B. Kern claims that it was the most spectacular step towards Christian unity since the days of the Apostles, for it brought together into one fold the largest Protestant denomination on earth. The event therefore called for some marked celebration, and this is the origin of Bishop Kern's book, *Methodism Has a Message* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $1.75). It contains the Jarrell Lecture for 1941 and was delivered at Emory University. On the assumption that such a great event must have a message which will meet God's expectation of the united Church, the lecturer sets out to say what that message is. It is the same religious witness as the Methodists of the eighteenth century gave. We need the same truth, believed with the same intensity and reality. The book expounds this truth in a series of chapters which are certainly impressive and inspiring. The titles reveal the author's aim: The Authority of Religious Experience; The Church of the Living God; Evangelism and the Saving of Souls; Human Society and Social Reform; Christian Nurture and the Educational Process; Spiritual Discipline and the Culture of Religious Living; and The Everlasting Gospel in our Day. It is good to hear these great themes pursued with such ability and appealing reality. A fine book, with a living word for to-day.

The Church Missionary Society (familiarly known as the C.M.S.) has a record in missionary history second to none. The full story of its origin and achievements is given in Dr. Eugene Stock's monumental work, but few readers in

these crowded times can find leisure to read through its four volumes. Something much briefer and more popular was needed, and it is now given in *C.M.S. Through the Years*, by the Rev. R. E. Doggett (C.M.S.: 1s. net). The story is written with admirable clearness from the days of the Society's origin in the Clapham Sect down to the present day. Rapid pictures succeed each other of mission work in Africa and India, in the Near East and in the Far East, and the success of the Society's work may be measured by the fact that during the last ten years baptisms have numbered over half a million. It is a heartsome thing in these chaotic days of war to read of the steady growth through a century and a half, and the triumphant success of a Christian enterprise which itself was born in war time.

There have been many books on the Lord's Prayer. And perhaps they are all needed. For the prayer is really a summary statement of practical and devotional Christianity. In any case *The Lord's Prayer in Wartime*, by the Rev. Edward Vernon, M.A. (James Clarke; 2s. 6d. net), is an excellent exposition. The author proceeds on the assumption that what is wanted by many people is a form of prayer at once simple and short, and *understood*. Such a form can be used at any time, and when, to use the author's expression, it 'tingles with meaning and reality,' it will be a constant resource. Mr. Vernon suggests that his readers should make a rendezvous with Christ at a certain point of their daily journey to their work, and there and then use the Lord's words. They will be greatly helped by an exposition that is always fresh and to the point. The titles of his chapters are apt, and the writer has his eye constantly on the needs and circumstances of these stormy days.

In these days so many people are shouting, in more or less strident tones: 'Here is the Church's last chance. If it does what I demand it may be saved; if not, it will certainly perish.' So, Mr. Dark and Mr. Murry. In *The Church Looks Ahead* (Faber & Faber; 3s. 6d. net) we have a different outlook. It contains broadcast addresses by Dr. Oldham, Miss Dorothy Sayers, Mr. T. S. Eliot, and others, and these distinguished persons are sometimes grave about the faults of the Church, which they see clearly, but they all believe that it has something to say and that it has a part to play in the shaping of a new world. The most revealing address is Dr. Oldham's which strikes a note that is echoed by others, the true nature of man as a *dependent* being, in dire need of help and renewal from above. Miss Sayers is, as usual, very definite and even provocative on the necessity of dogma, but always interesting and rewarding. Perhaps the most intriguing of the addresses is that of Father D'Arcy, S.J. He was entrusted with the subject: 'The Unity behind our Differences,' and he is very clever about it, avoiding almost entirely the real issue, and confining himself to broad general and innocuous agreements. The book as a whole is stimulating and reassuring, as one would expect from such notable speakers and such positive believers.

Under the title of *The Silent Bells* (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net) the Rev. John Macbeath, D.D., has issued seven short meditations suitable for Christmas. He deals with the old familiar story with freshness and with fine devotional feeling. It is an eminently readable and helpful little book.

The Anglican Evangelical Group Movement has issued a third volume of a series on *Discipleship*. It is entitled *The Holy Spirit and the Kingdom*, edited by the Rev. J. P. Hodges and the Rev. R. B. Parker (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). It contains fifty-two lessons arranged for use in the Sunday school. Its method, very happily chosen, is to teach the doctrine of the Holy Spirit by what is seen of the Spirit's working in the lives of Bible people. The lessons are arranged with great skill and aptly illustrated.

Bishop G. L. King: The Man and his Message (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net) is a memoir by an unnamed writer of one who faithfully served the Church and cause of Christ through a long lifetime in various spheres at home and abroad. A brief account is given here of his labours in a Tyneside Parish, as Bishop in Madagascar, as Secretary of the S.P.G. and as Canon in Rochester. In a brief Foreword the Bishop of St. Albans pays tribute to him as 'an Englishman who was endowed with good but not brilliant brains, who could say what he had to say but was no orator . . . yet, nevertheless did the biggest thing that is given to any man to do: he got the best out of all sorts and conditions of men and women, young and old, by bringing them to know and love and serve our Blessed Lord, and go on doing so with real joy in their hearts.'

Professor R. H. Strachan, D.D., of the Chair of New Testament Language and Literature, Westminster College, Cambridge, has revised and rewritten his work, first published twenty-three years ago, on *The Fourth Gospel* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net). It consists of an Introduction and a Commentary. Since its first publication there has been a great renewal of interest in this Gospel, and the critical movement has swung towards a more central and conservative interpretation. Dr. Strachan now shows the influence of this movement upon his own standpoint. He has joined the ranks of those who regard the Gospel as essentially a literary unity; and he also recognizes both its supreme value as an authentic exposition of the self-consciousness of Jesus Christ, and its reliability on the side of historical presentation, particularly in its presentation of the story of the Passion. We welcome this attractive work in its new form.

Englishmen's Attitude towards Corporate Religion.

By the Reverend W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford.

The average Englishman assigns very little value to Corporate Religion. He is unmistakably an Individualist. What his religion precisely is may not be easy to ascertain. His intimate friends do not always know. It seems practically in many cases to leave God out, and to consist of a moral code. Whether it includes the practice of prayer is not obvious. What is obvious is that he regards associated devotion with aloofness and apparent indifference. If he has any religion, that is a personal private affair between himself and his Maker.

This attitude of indifference to corporate expressions of religion is a modern phenomenon in striking contrast to the practice of the past.

In the religion of Israel both the individual and the corporate aspects of religion found full and frequent expression. When Hezekiah received in wartime an insulting letter, he went into the temple, and spread it before the Lord. When the Psalmist was perplexed he said, 'Then thought I to understand this, but it was too hard for me until I went into the Sanctuary of God, then understood I.' When his friends invited him to corporate religion he said, 'I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the House of the Lord.' When the prophets desired to promote a revival of religion their appeal to the people was this: 'Assemble yourselves and come; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations.' [1] 'Gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children. . . . Then will the Lord be jealous for his land, and pity his people.' [2]

The contrast between that outlook and the prevalent individualism of to-day is very great. In the past, the corporate and the individual aspects of religion have been combined in the experience of men. Their modern divorce requires that their relative worth should be carefully reconsidered.

The appropriate way to begin is to bear in mind the actual constitution of human nature. In ordinary secular life the individual and the social aspects are so intimately united that they cannot be divorced. A human infant is more dependent on the social than any other being in creation. However self-centred and individualist he tries to be he cannot thrive without constant association with other human beings. As he matures he derives his knowledge largely from his inheritance and his associations. His language, his ways of thought, his outlook upon life, are those of a particular locality and of a particular time. He cannot open his mouth without giving himself away, and revealing to what nation and what century he belongs. He acquires, when associated with his fellows, powers which he is unable to acquire when alone. Since, therefore, human nature requires companionship for the development of all its secular capacities, the presumption is that similar conditions will be required for the development of its spiritual capacities.

That presumption recent psychology has done very much to confirm. When psychologists fifty years ago applied their methods to religion they confined their attention to the individual. In that celebrated book, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, William James regarded religion exclusively as the experience of an individual person who feels himself alone with the Divine. This treatment of the subject was, from the psychologist's standpoint, at that time, perfectly natural. But, as later thinkers, such as Gustave le Bon,[3] have so convincingly pointed out, there is not only a psychology of the individual, there is also a psychology of the crowd, and the two are widely different. And this difference exerts a powerful effect in religion. Professor Pratt,[4] for example, reminds us that the Religion of an individual has two sources: his personal capacity is one, the other is the experience which he acquires by association with his fellows.

The group mind has distinctions of its own. As William M'Dougall (1921) says, a society has a certain individuality which it does not derive from the units of which at any given time it may be composed, but is the result of its own past. The social tradition, expressed through institutions and records, is more permanent than the short-lived members of the community. The individual is what he is because of and by virtue of community.[5]

[1] Is 45^{20}. [2] Jl $2^{16.\ 18}$.

[3] *The Crowd.*

[4] *The Religious Consciousness* (1920).

[5] *The Group Mind*, 7, 13–18. See also Royce's criticism on William James in *Sources of Religious Insight*, 48, 62.

Professor Royce of Harvard wrote in a similar strain. 'A community is not a collection of individuals. It is a living unit. It has a mind of its own, a mind which is not the same as that of an individual, its psychology is different. The characteristic products of the social mind are languages, customs, religions, *i.e.* mental products.[1]

A community behaves like an entity with a mind of its own. The community is an object of love and loyalty; for example, one's family—or school—or nation.[2]

It is plain that this must apply to religion as well as to all else. The development of the spiritual capacities of the individual in isolation from social experience is no more normal than the development of his intellectual or moral capacities would be in such a condition. Man is essentially social. He must be social in religion.

When attention is given to the two main aspects of religion, the individual and the corporate, it should be in the light of these considerations.

1. Consider, then, first by itself *the individual* aspect of religion. The importance of personal religion it is impossible to exaggerate. The student of comparative religions may have intellectual ideas about a number of religions in none of which he believes. They are not his. A religion inherited, but not appropriated, is not our religion at all. No religion becomes our personal possession until it secures the consent of our mind and of our will, and we believe it with all our heart.

But in proportion as the individual begins to realize the magnitude of religion, being in fact the highest theme on which a creature's mind can dwell, he will of necessity grow conscious of his own personal limitations and incapacities. That is the invariable experience of the deeply religious. Whether he knows it or not, the mind of the individual is usually narrow and small. We are convinced of it in others, and sometimes suspect it in ourselves. Experience proves that the individual is not seldom attracted by one aspect of his religion, and repelled by another. The one is congenial to his antecedents, or his temperament, or his personal needs, while the other is not. His tendency is to see what he appreciates out of right proportion, to exaggerate it, while he depreciates another aspect of religion, which sometimes is not less important than that which he esteems. It is not unusual to find that the religion which an individual actually holds is a mere fragment of that which he professes to receive. Nor is it uncommon for an individual to find that ideas about religion which in an early stage of his spiritual development he ignored or under-valued or discredited, are realized in his maturer life to be after all divinely true, and actually indispensable to the completeness of the very religion which he had all along professed.

2. With these reflections in mind we pass to consider secondly *the corporate* aspect of religion.

No one, of course, can dwell for any time on Corporate Religion without being conscious, painfully conscious of its defects. They are countless and pathetic. Corporate Religion is liable to degenerate. It can become a mere musical display. It can be only a lecture room or a preaching house. It may be conspicuous for the absence of a devotional spirit. The very last name that would accurately describe it is at times the House of Prayer. The spiritual level varies from one congregation to another. It may descend to the level of a pleasant Sunday afternoon. The writer of an allegory did not hesitate to pronounce about a great choral procession—that not a sound of it ascended up to heaven. A Free Church minister said in print of a well-known preacher, 'Witty, humorous, immensely entertaining, it was a bad interpretation destitute of serious purpose, the popular lecturer had driven out the earnest minister of the Christian gospel.' But we need not go outside the Bible itself for the severest criticism of the imperfections to which Corporate Religion may descend. Only think of the message to the Seven Churches of Asia: Thou hast forsaken thy first love; to another, I have a few things against thee . . . repent: or else I will come unto thee quickly; to another, I will give unto every one of you according to your works, but that which ye have already hold fast till I come; to another, thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead. Be watchful and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God; to another, thou hast a little strength, and hast kept My Word, and hast not denied My Name; to another, thou art neither hot nor cold, because thou sayest I am rich and increased with goods and hast need of nothing, and knowest not that thou art wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked. Human complaisancy must have got a shock in those centres of corporate religion when it received such frank and downright denunciation of its defects.

And sincerity requires the remembrance of its defects when we insist on its importance. But if the critic of the Church's defects is himself an individualist, it would be well for him to remember that individual religion has also its imperfections. Indeed, all religion, whether individual or social, being the characteristic of imperfect creatures, is certain to be sadly compromised by their defects. Yet nevertheless both aspects of religion may be necessary to our spiritual progress, and neither of them something that we can safely do without.

It is significant that those who dislike and oppose religion frequently combine to suppress its corporate expressions. That was the case in the early centuries of persecution. It has been the method adopted in many cases since. It is superfluous to allude to contemporary illustrations. Wherever this method is employed it reveals a belief that religion is promoted and continued by corporate association; and that to injure or prevent such social expressions is to weaken its influence and promote its disappearance.

There are many Englishmen to-day who stand aloof from all corporate expressions of religion, many who deeply resent recent endeavours to injure the cause of religion by forcible attempts

[1] *The Problem of Christianity*, i. 62.
[2] Cf. *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 69.

at its suppression. But ought they not in reason to consider whether it is not also possible to injure religion by indifference? It is a serious question whether to stand aloof from all social expressions of devotion, all public recognition of anything higher than the human may not also be as injurious to the cause of religion as open resistance against it. Is it not possible that passive indifference may be more hurtful than active opposition? Does not history show that when a religion is persecuted its adherents are sifted and tried. The conventionalists disappear, but the men of faith endure. Fortitude, firmness, and martyrdom are created. But when a religion is only coldly treated and neglected, and its assemblies are reduced to a miserable handful, the sense of ineffectiveness falls upon it, and its influence on the nation becomes negligible. The violence of resolute opposition is safer for a religious community to endure than the chilling effect of solitude and indifference.

Many would agree with Bishop Butler that, if Christ and His Apostles had done nothing but teach religion to their contemporaries, the benefits of their instruction would have reached but to a small part of mankind, and 'Christianity must have been, in a great degree, sunk and forgot in a very few ages. To prevent this, appears to have been one reason why a visible church was instituted: to be, like a city set upon an hill, a standing memorial to the world of the duty which we owe to our Maker: to call men continually, both by example and instruction . . . to attend to it, and, by the form of religion, ever before their eyes, remind them of the reality; to be the repository of the oracles of God.'[1]

3. Seeing then that every individual, even at the best, is always an imperfect specimen of the race, subject to the defects of his qualities; and that many a man has lived to find that Corporate Religion had all along maintained important elements of truth ready for his assent and appreciation when he, the independent individualist, became sufficiently matured to appreciate them and to take them in, are we not thereby led to conclude that the true relation to religion is only achieved when the individual and the corporate aspects of it are in their rightful proportion united.

Consider for example, the reflections of S. Augustine[2] on the religious one-sided individualism of his own earlier career.

It is on the religious individualism of his earlier life. In adolescence he reacted from his inherited religion, being attracted to Dualism on the ground that it relied entirely on reason, and made no demand on faith. This attractive promise proved delusive, but his adherence to Dualism lasted with increasing uneasiness for years. Then at length he withdrew altogether. In the retrospect he felt the need of some authority beyond his own. He saw the inevitableness of faith in secular affairs. How otherwise could you be sure whose child you were? How otherwise could you enter the married state? And if it was impossible to dispense with faith in wordly matters, must not the same be expected in spiritual matters also, where our capacity is lowest, and the subject itself is the highest? And if a critic were to object that it would be better to rely on reasoning, Augustine replies, Perhaps. But would the critic hold that every individual is qualified to appreciate the value of our reasonings? Are the competent the many, or are they only the few? The critic owns that the qualified are but few. Then asked Augustine, Do you consider yourself to be one of the few or of the many? The critic replied, It is not for me to decide. Well, urged Augustine, I believe that you are among the few. But what about the majority? The less gifted? Is religion to be withheld from them? And if not, how are they to acquire it unless by faith?

This self-scrutiny is impressive, both because of the author's personal experience, and because of his outstanding ability, and because of the position he has held ever since in the religious thought of the world. Thus this keen appreciator of individual religion saw also its limitations, and the necessity of supplementing its defects by the assistance of Corporate Religion, which is greater than that of the individual. Considering the exceptional insight and ability in religion with which Augustine was so richly endowed, his insistence on our need of powers which the individual does not possess is all the more impressive.

The essentially corporate nature of the Christian religion as expounded in the Apostolic teaching has been impressively realized by some eminent independent thinkers of our own time. Ritschl, for instance, reflects, 'how little in general St. Paul is thinking of individuals, how much rather, when pursuing the theme of the application of the grace of God, he has large masses of mankind in view, is evident from the fact that he finds consolation for the present hardening of the people of Israel in the prophecy of their conversion. He has thus no interest in the destiny of the many individual members of this nation who depart life before that consummation.'[3] Similarly his having preached the gospel from Jerusalem to Illyricum means that he had 'established a Christian Community in the chief city of every Province.'[4] 'We must therefore recognize the fact that the individual enters upon the common human task of Christianity never merely as an individual, but always under the conditions, whether favourable or unfavourable, of his peculiar national education.'[5] Ritschl's conclusion, therefore, is that 'just as little as the individual, whether in a physical or spiritual aspect, can be rightly represented outside the sphere of his nationality, as little can the individual, regarded as an object of Divine justification, be represented outside of the Christian Community."[6] Reconciliation is primarily related to the whole of the Christian Community and to individuals only as they attach

[1] *Analogy*, ed. Gladstone, Bk. ii. ch. 1, par. 10, p. 192.
[2] *De Utilitate Credendi*.
[3] *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, Eng. Tr., iii. (1900), 131.
[4] *Ib.*, 132. [5] *Ib.*, 134. [6] *Ib.*, 138.

themselves to this Community.[1] For in an organism, all the individual members work together as means to the welfare of the whole, and apart from this no member exists as a member of the whole.

No recent writer, it seems safe to say, has treated the united value of the individual and social aspects of the Christian religion more attractively than Professor Royce. The Christian Community is in St. Paul's own experience something new, whose origin he views as wholly supernatural. It is to St. Paul the social Body of Christ. It is the object of the love of Christ. 'Both the Community and its individual members are the objects of an infinite concern.' 'The member finds his salvation in union with the Church.' Hence the obligation of loyalty. Accordingly, Royce made a special study of what he called the Philosophy of Loyalty.

In a memorable sentence Royce declared that 'the perfect union of this inspired passion for the Community, with this tender fondness for individuals, is at once the secret of the Apostle's power as a missionary, and the heart of his new doctrine.'

The relation of Christian individuals to each other is determined by their relation to the Church. 'So live together that the Church may be worthy of Christ who loves it, so help the individual brother that he may be a fitting member of the Church. Such are now the counsels of love.'[2]

The Church—'the divinely significant spiritual Community to which all must belong who are to win the true goal of life.'[3]

'In social life Individualism and Collectivism are tendencies each of which, as our social order grows, intensifies the other.'[4]

'Paul and his apostolic Christians were not content with *family loyalty*, or with *clan loyalty*, or with a love for *any community* that they conceived as *merely natural* in its origin. A miracle, as they held, had created the body of Christ. To this new spiritual being, whose level was that of a community, and whose membership was human, but whose origin was, in their opinion, divine, their love and their life were due. Christianity was the religion of loyalty to this new creation.'[5]

May it not be said that the true relation of these two aspects of religion is that which is given us by Saul of Tarsus—a born individualist, able to stand alone in the presence of a fellow apostle. 'I withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed.' 'To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour.' It might have seemed as if a Pauline Communion as well as a Petrine were conceivable. The man of Tarsus could say, 'the Son of God loved *me*, and gave Himself for *me*.' There you have the personal side of religion expressed with all its force. The concentration of the love of Christ on the Individual—on *me*—as if there were no other that concerned Him. But it is really no less than providential that the corporate aspect of religion is by the same pen just as forcibly recorded. 'Christ loved *the Church* and gave Himself for *it*.' And what this wonderful man felt was unmistakably that if the social Community was the object of the love of Christ, so also it must be the object of the love of His disciple. Saul simply identified himself with Corporate Religion for all that he was worth, and sacrificed to it everything that he possessed. If we knew where he was buried, and wanted an inscription for his grave, we could scarcely do better than apply to him the words he applied to his Master: He loved the Church and gave himself for it.

If the individual recognizes a personal responsibility according to his place and his powers to the social community in secular affairs, has he no corresponding responsibility in spiritual matters also? Either he is more matured in religion than the generality of his time, or he is less: if more, then corporate religion needs his strength; if less, then he needs the strength of corporate religion. In reality the fact is that in one respect he can give and in another respect he can receive. The critic who stands aloof from corporate religion incurs a grave responsibility.

4. Finally, attention should be given to the bearing of Corporate Religion on the Fatherhood of God, and consequently on the brotherhood of man. Can Deity be unconcerned what attitude His intelligent creation adopts towards individual and social devotion?

If prayer, which is the distinctive expression of religion, is considered, it surely does appear that corporate devotion is a practical result of belief in the Fatherhood of God. For if our reply to the questions: 'Have we not all one Father? Did not one God create us?' is affirmative; does not the Fatherhood of God involve that He would not only have His children commune with Him as individuals in isolation, but also associated in recognition of the relation which they share in common, both to Him and also to each other? Is it not also exactly what democracy would lead us to appreciate as more calculated than anything else to express our equality in His sight, and to neutralize the separative effects of our artificial class distinctions, and the qualities that tend to divide?

United self-prostration in the presence of One before whom our distinctions are reduced to nothing must tend to emphasize what we all alike possess. Consequently to unite us as members of one family. The brotherhood of man is surely promoted by corporate acknowledgment of the Fatherhood of God.

[1] *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, Eng. Tr., iii. (1900), 139.
[2] Royce, 103. [3] *Ib.*, 110. [4] *Ib.*, 152.
[5] *Ib.*, 170.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

How to Speak the Truth.

By Professor A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., Mansfield College, Oxford.

'Speaking the truth in love.'—Eph 4^{15}.

There used to live in Edinburgh an interesting old Professor called John Stuart Blackie. John Stuart Blackie, being an interesting and lovable man, had many friends to whom he used to write regularly. On the envelope of each letter that he wrote to them his friends always saw three strange words in Greek lettering. They were *alētheuōn en agapē*. Where did he get those words, and what did they mean?

The three words come from the New Testament. In fact they come from a letter of St. Paul's, and they mean, 'speaking the truth in love.' That, you see, was the keynote of all Professor Blackie's letters. It was in that spirit he wrote them. He spoke the truth to his friends in love. 'Speaking the truth in love'; it's a grand motto not only for letter-writing but for living.

1. *Speak the truth.* That's the first thing. We must at all costs speak what we know to be true—tell the truth and hang the consequences. I know that there is one man who doesn't agree with me. In fact, he—that man—believes in lies. When you tell a lie, he says, make it a big one—a whopper! But we are not going to follow that man—*Führer* though he calls himself. I would rather follow another German, far greater than Hitler—Martin Luther who lived about four hundred years ago. Luther was out for truth at all costs. He saw how wicked the Roman Catholic Church was then in many ways, and although he was a minister of that Church, he boldly said so. Of course he made enemies: bad men never like to hear the truth. At last he was summoned to attend a great conference in order to defend himself. His friends were very afraid what might happen to him. 'Don't go, Martin,' they said, 'or if you do go, recant—take back what you've said.' But Luther went and he spoke the truth, and his words on that occasion will never be forgotten—'Here I stand. God help me. I can no other.'

So copy Luther, not Hitler. Speak the truth but—

2. *Speak it in love.* There are some truthful people who can't do that. They speak the truth, but they hurt other people unnecessarily. They call themselves frank people; but they are really *brutally* frank people. They know maybe what truth is, but they don't know what love is. Isn't that the difference that Christianity makes or ought to make in a man? He speaks the truth, but he speaks it in love. He is frank but never cruel.

When you get older I hope you'll read a little letter in the New Testament. It is only twenty-five verses long. I mean the Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon, and it is a perfect example of speaking the truth in love.

There's a story behind that letter. Philemon of Colossæ had a slave called Onesimus. Onesimus, alas, stole some of his master's money and bolted. Months afterwards he turned up far away in Rome, and there by good fortune—or rather Providence—he met St. Paul, then waiting his trial. Onesimus made a clean breast of his wickedness to St. Paul and became a Christian. Paul grew very fond of him, but knowing his story he decided it was his duty to send Onesimus back to his rightful master. So he sat down and wrote a little letter to Philemon for Onesimus to take back with him, and this is what (in effect) he said in it:

My dear Philemon,—

I'm sending Onesimus back. Be a good chap and receive him kindly. I know all about the money he's stolen. Don't worry about that: I'll pay you back. Now, I could order you to do what I say—for you owe your salvation to me—but I prefer to appeal to you *for love's sake*. Remember Onesimus is a Christian now—a new man. So take him back and treat him like a dear brother.

Yours speaking the truth in love,

Paul.

That's the way to do it. Speak the truth, but, as you are a Christian, speak it in love.

Our Eyes Fixed upon Jesus.

By the Reverend James T. Hudson, B.D., B.A., Clayton-le-Moors, Accrington.

'Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.'—Heb 12^{2}.

The other day I opened a German book printed more than fifty years ago, and found on the title page a beautiful little picture, no bigger than a shilling, with a Latin motto round it. The picture was of a sailing ship at sea, with a man standing at the bow, and over it shining a star; and the motto said, 'By winds, by hands, by a star.' It was the publishers of the book, the people who printed and sold it, who had chosen that motto. What did they mean?

They meant that their life and work of making and selling books was a voyage of adventure. Every voyage is an adventure, and a ship's first officer once said to me, 'Every voyage is dangerous.' Those who know life best know that it is dangerous. We all know that it is dangerous now, when there is this great storm blowing and we never know where the next bomb will drop; but there are

long stretches of our life that are calm. Out of thirteen weeks that I have spent at sea only one week was not calm, and that was not a storm. But when the sea is smooth and the voyage uneventful, and most of our life is like that, there is always danger: and a never-failing watch ahead must be kept for other ships, floating wreckage, or ice.

Now our motto says, *By winds*. The ship is a sailing ship and is dependent on the winds. They may wreck it, but without them it cannot move. Without wind it is becalmed,

> As idle as a painted ship
> Upon a painted ocean.

Now that is like our life. There are all kinds of forces that we have not made, and for which we are not responsible. Sometimes they threaten to wreck our life, but we cannot move without them. The voyage of life is made by means of them. They are the winds that make the ship to go. The most important of these forces are the natural desires for food and drink, for love, home, for friendship and for success. These desires God has made part of our nature. Without these desires our life would lie becalmed: we should do nothing at all—indeed we should be lower than the lowest savages. But the very winds that make the ship to go may wreck it. The winds, like our desires, are a necessary danger.

But our motto says, *By hands*. On a steamer the real sailors, the men who live in the fo'castle, have little to do during the voyage except paint the ship, though that keeps them busy all the time; but on a sailing ship the sailors are always busy trimming the sails, hauling at the ropes and taking advantage of the winds. That is their work. By the sails and ropes they harness the winds to the work of sailing the ship. They can even use the wind's force to drive the ship in a direction opposite to the wind. They call that sailing into the wind, and they do it by tacking. By their hands, then, the sailors make the winds help them on their voyage. And so with our lives. These forces in us and around us we are not meant to obey but to use. By our efforts we can use our natural desires, and the stronger our desires the faster we shall travel and the better voyage we shall make, if we control them aright, if we learn to *handle* them. Handle, remember, means using the hands to a thing. Our motto says, *By hands*.

But neither winds nor hands are of any use unless there is something to steer by. Nowadays the sailor has the mariner's compass, but sometimes the captain cannot trust his compass, and then he must steer by the stars, which is what they did before they had the compass. And so our motto says, *By a star*. The star is the pole star, which is always in the north. Other stars change their position with the time of the day and the season of the year, but not the pole star. That is a safe guide. And we too have a star. Guided by a star the wise men came to Bethlehem. Jesus is our star. He never changes. We set our course by Him. Every day we make 'an observation,' as the sailors say, of Him. And so our motto leads to another—'Our eyes fixed upon Jesus.'

The Christian Year.

Quinquagesima

As to the Lord's Supper.

By the Reverend A. B. Lavelle, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Darlaston, Staffordshire.

'But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.'—1 Co 11[28].

It is a solemnizing thought that every act of Christian worship is the proclamation of the Presence of the Living Lord. Beside the tremendous reality of this simple but ineffable *Quicumque Vult* much that otherwise seems important pales into insignificance. Bitter orthodoxy, fussy religiosity, and nervous scrupulosity are alike stilled in the fructifying silences of His Presence. Is it not this Presence that makes every assembly of the Christian Church different from all other gatherings? And if the Lord is present whenever His people meet, He need be no stranger at our own hearthstone.

> For Thou, within no walls confined,
> Inhabitest the humble mind;
> Such ever bring Thee, where they come,
> And going, take Thee to their home.

1. Yet it is the witness of the Christian centuries that the real saving Presence of Christ is most personally revealed to the receptive heart 'in the breaking of bread.' Throughout history there is the most touching unanimity on this spiritual significance of the Lord's Supper where there is the most fundamental conflict of interpretation. How vain have been the efforts to assess in cold debate this supreme adventure of the Sacrament! 'Man's apprehensions are often nearer than their expressions: they mean the same thing when they seem not to say the same thing' is a saying of Benjamin Whichcote that is probably more true of the history of the Eucharist than of any other article of Christian belief. Is it not enough to say with Calvin of the Presence of the Lord, 'I rather experience than understand it'?

In this earliest literary record of the Lord's Supper there is a refreshing primitive simplicity we do well to heed. St. Paul's words in this the most practical of his letters turn us from any self-engrossment in the subtleties of dialectic to the spiritual wisdom of self-scrutiny and preparation. 'Let a man examine himself.' Let him penetrate the dark corners of his own heart before he presume to look into this 'Mirror of Christ.' 'Look that thou thyself art in order, and leave God the task of unravelling the skein of the world and destiny,' says Amiel. 'All the supreme realities and truths are incomprehensible,' but 'indefinitely apprehensible' is the encouraging warning of Baron Von Hügel.

'Let a man examine himself.' The cry, 'The

Holy for the Holy,' is the ancient liturgical prelude to the Lord's Supper. Let a man, then, cultivate a closer acquaintance with the soul that looks out through the vizard of religion, and let him see to it that he bring to the Lord's Supper a real presence of his sin-stained self. Only repentance with newness of life is the 'humble access' that enables us to claim:

We need not now go up to heaven
To bring the long-sought Saviour down;
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost e'en now Thy Banquet crown:
To every faithful soul appear,
And shew Thy Real Presence here.

2. Was it not a sure spiritual instinct that in the Middle Ages led men to regard a meditation upon the Passion as the best preparation for the Lord's Supper? For here we see Christ 'visibly depicted crucified,' and here in this historical-mystical moment we come to the very heart of the gospel as we pray—

Look, Father, look on His anointed face,
And only look on us as found in Him.

The love of God and the sin of man are the flash points of the flame of all Christian experience. But it is in the Cross that we most truly awaken to that dark power clothed in our well-conducted worldliness and irresponsibility which is so often ready to crucify 'the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame.' 'The Lord looketh on the heart,' and the pages of the gospel are themselves the great Parable of Judgment on the human heart. It is from the lips of the Lord Himself that there comes an indictment of human nature which might well shatter our most jaunty self-assurance. 'For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness: all these things proceed from within, and defile the man.'

'If any is holy let him come: if any is unholy let him repent' is the invitation of the Didache. The Lord's Supper brings us the highest moment in the moral dynamic of Christian worship. For it is only as we share the risen life of the Crucified Redeemer that we can 'come holy and clean to such a heavenly Feast.' 'Religion is born,' said the late Lord Tweedsmuir, 'when we accept the ultimate frustration of mere human effort, and at the same time realize the strength which comes from union with superhuman reality.'

Let never more our sinful souls
The anguish of Thy Cross renew,
Nor forge again the cruel nails
That pierced Thy victim body through.

Come, bread of Heaven, to feed our souls,
And with thee, Jesus, enter in;
Come, wine of God, and as we drink
His precious Blood, wash out our sin.

3. Above everything else the Lord's Supper speaks of that reconciliation of the individual and the community that frets our age. In this Epistle St. Paul castigates those who remain blind to the social implications of this purifying rite in the school of Divine Love. For here is the secret of the love that should bind the whole Beloved Community together. In that forgotten book of the last war, *A Student in Arms*, Donald Hankey tells how 'one Sunday morning the Student went, as his custom is, to Holy Communion, where he took the Bread and Wine in the visible company of the sergeant-major's wife and daughter. But when he shut his eyes he saw a whole host of figures that he knew and loved kneeling, as he thought, at his side. Yet this was the perplexing part, that so far as he knew, a great many of them had never been to Church, unless they were marched there. They were his old comrades.' Like Donald Hankey we too can enter this fellowship that bridges time and eternity and is 'the blessed company of all faithful people.' 'Let a man examine himself' ere he presume to join himself to that mystical body where the Church Triumphant is one with the Church Militant. Here in the Lord's Supper is God's trysting-place for the bereaved soul.

4. 'Let a man examine himself,' for the Lord's Supper is itself a preparation for daily discipleship. The white bread and the red wine speak to us of the very wounds of the Saviour, but they are also symbols of our daily sustenance. Here is no escape from life into another world, but a transformation of life in a transfigured world. Mrs. De Bary (Anna Bunston), in her lines on *A Basque Peasant Returning from Church*, tells us of the ecstasy that comes to our 'amphibious life' when we receive from the Giver the Gift of Himself.

O strangers passing in your car,
You pity me who come so far
On dusty feet ill shod;
You cannot guess, you cannot know
Upon what wings of joy I go
Who travel home with God.

The Lord's Presence at His Supper must mean that we can say, 'Behold the tabernacle of God shall be with men.' We can never think of God and of ourselves in sub-personal terms. From the Lord's Supper we 'travel home with God.' For though our worship is corporate, we can never be lost 'in the crowd.' 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup,' and St. Paul's own life is the best commentary on his famous words.

First Sunday in Lent.

Judas Iscariot: A Study in Temptation.

'Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.'—Jn 13[21].

Judas is an enigma. No one quite understands him. But let us try to come as near understanding him as we can.

Why did Jesus choose a man like that to be one

of His twelve Apostles? He knew, we are told, what was in man. His choice of the Twelve was no haphazard choice. It was thoughtful: it was deliberate. We are definitely told that prayer to His Father preceded it. How came He then to choose this man of Kerioth?

One answer to that question has been this: that Judas was preordained to be the villain of the piece. Were that the explanation, there would not be blame but only pity in our hearts for Judas. It is God, and not he whom we would condemn. Merely to state that explanation is to feel that it is impossible. Let us dismiss, once for all, any idea that may vaguely linger in our minds that Judas was fated to be what he was, fated to do what he did. Such an idea is a slander on God. God damns no one beforehand. Not we in our evil deeds, any more than Judas, can take shelter behind any such excuse as that. Like Judas, we are responsible for what we are and do.

Let us start from this, that Jesus chose Judas for precisely the same reason that He chose the others, that He saw in him the raw material of a saint. Surely that first view of Judas is confirmed by the reflection that if Jesus chose him, he chose Jesus. Was a radically bad man likely to give up his trade, leave his home and friends, and follow round the country a religious teacher who offered no material inducements?

Well, then, what went wrong? How did Judas become capable of that devilry which has made his name a byword for nineteen centuries? With so good a start, how did he come to make so bad an end? God alone knows. Here we touch mystery. And by no means in the life of Judas alone. Why, we ourselves have known those who, to begin with, promised well, who seemed to have everything in their favour, and yet somehow took a wrong turning and ended disastrously, in a manner that mystified us. Nay, if it comes to that, do not some of us, looking back, and remembering what once we were, do not some of us wonder how we are just the people we are? But for our own admonition and guidance let us do what we can and put our fingers on what seem to be two weak joints in the armour of Judas. What was his bad side?

Well, in the first place, he was over-fond of money. The Gospels say so. He had a turn for business management, and was made the treasurer of the Apostles' band. For a good long time, we can imagine, while the first impression Jesus had made on his heart was fresh and strong, Judas was an honest treasurer. He heard the Master say some very strong things about covetousness and the perils of Mammon worship. No doubt that had its effect. Ah, yes, but we know how the effect of spiritual impressions can wear off, how familiarity can make us at last insensitive to a preacher and the truth he declares? Judas began, we are told, to pilfer from the bag. No doubt he found excuses for himself, told himself that what he took was, somehow, only his due, hid from himself somehow the fact that he was just a shabby thief.

Is it almost unintelligible how a man could think and feel like that while in the company of Jesus? There is something which is just as difficult to understand—the thoughts we can think when we are in the company of Jesus, at the Communion Table, for example, the things we can go straight from that Table and do. Is that not just as unintelligible? Surely, we think, a man, who had heard Jesus say the things He said about money, should have been delivered from greed. But consider ourselves. We have heard and read often enough the impressive warnings of Jesus about covetousness. How much have they impressed us? How much have we taken them to heart?

Thirty pieces of silver is about £4 in our coinage. That wasn't much. The mere fact that Judas did not screw far more than that out of the priests, suggests that, while covetousness helped to rot the finer instincts of his heart and made him capable of his treachery, it was not covetousness alone that made him do what he did. Other evil passions moved him, other base motives worked in him. He was angry. He was furious with Jesus when he betrayed Him. Disappointed, selfish ambition made him furious. Selfish ambition was another weak joint in the armour of Judas. He had believed that Jesus was going to set up His throne in Jerusalem, and reign as an earthly King. He was not solitary among the disciples in that delusion. Far from it. James and John schemed to get the chief places for themselves in the coming Kingdom. And Judas had his own dreams. He saw himself, no doubt, raised to some place of power and wealth and splendour, as one of the King's chosen friends. For that he waited and held on. Again and again, at the height of His popularity, Jesus, it seemed to him, missed golden chances of making Himself a King, wilfully missed them, and at first Judas was mystified, and then grew sour and angry. But at last came Palm Sunday and the triumphant entrance into the Holy City. But, once again, Judas was disappointed. Jesus did nothing, let the chance go by. The heart of Judas filled with a passionate bitterness of pique and disappointment. What a fool he had been, following this man about for so long, telling the people that a Kingdom was coming. Fooled himself and fooling them. What had he got out of it? Nothing, absolutely nothing but trouble and loss, and the suspicion of the authorities that might soon clap him in a dungeon. All the sour, selfish thoughts that he had allowed to fester within him came to a head when Palm Sunday led to nothing. The evil in Judas had now the upper hand. His old admiration for Jesus had turned to something like hatred and a spirit of revenge. When under the sway of pique, of disappointed ambition, of hatred, men can do insane and terrible things. And the insane and horrible thought came to Judas to betray his Master. Read the account of the Last Supper, and we see that Jesus read that purpose in the heart of Judas, and tried in more ways than one to draw him away from it. By that time Judas was set in his evil purpose, and not even the eyes of Jesus Christ could turn

him from it. We have two last horrible glimpses of the man after the deed was done. After he had, in some measure, come to himself, we see him tortured by remorse, flinging back to the priests the blood money they had given him. We see him driven to mad despair and killing himself as unfit to live.

This sermon, now that it is done, has been a complete failure if any of us still think of Judas as an unnatural monster with whom we have nothing in common, if any of us cannot see, in our own hearts, passions that can make as great a tragedy of our lives as Judas made of his. Have we never shuddered at the thought of what we might become if we let certain motives, thoughts, feelings within us have their way? That fear is a healthy thing. If we know nothing of it whatever, we know neither our own heart nor human life. Through trust in God there is deliverance from that fear. 'The Lord is thy keeper. The Lord shall keep thee from evil. He shall keep thy soul. The Lord shall keep thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth and even for evermore.'[1]

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Ability of Faith.

BY THE REVEREND R. C. BROUGHTON, B.D.,
COSBY, LEICESTER.

'And Caleb stilled the people before Moses, and said, Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it. But the men that went up with him said, We be not able to go up against the people; for they are stronger than we.'—Nu $13^{30, 31}$.

It is always interesting to notice how different people give varying reports of the same events. With the best intentions in the world one witness in a Law Court will give evidence which is easily contradicted by some one quite as sincere. In such a case, all the skill and wisdom of the legal profession is needed to distinguish what a witness actually did see from what he only thought he saw.

Nothing reminds us of this inability of two people to see exactly the same thing as the familiar lines of the poet:

> Two men looked out through prison bars,
> One saw mud, the other stars.

Both men had the same view before them. Both gazed through the same bars. Yet one, like Bunyan's man with the muck rake, kept his eyes to the ground. The other looked up to contemplate the sparkling hosts above. For both men the conditions of life were identical. The difference was in the men themselves. Because *they* were so different their *world* seemed so different. Whether they saw life as a muddy morass or aflame with the brightness of heaven, depended on what they were in themselves.

Here is the explanation of the conflicting reports brought back by the scouts sent forward by Moses into the Promised Land. They had each the same task to fulfil. They had the same country before them. They moved amongst the same peoples. Yet the accounts they furnished to their fellows were as contradictory as could be.

Ten out of the twelve saw nothing but the mud. They were men of fearful heart. They noted the difficult and terrifying aspects of their task. And what a tale of woe they told! 'The people that dwell in the land are strong; the cities are walled up and very strong; moreover the children of Anak are there.' Fear is as infectious as the measles. As these men tell their story, the whole crowd is panic stricken. Caleb has to 'still the people.' Then the evil tidings continue. 'It is a land that doth eat up the inhabitants thereof; all the men we saw in it are men of great stature. There we saw the Nephilim; and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.'

But, thank God, two others saw the stars. Caleb and Joshua both saw the difficulties, but were not dismayed. They too observed the sons of Anak, the fenced cities, and the Nephilim; yet their hearts never faltered. They were confident in their resources. Difficulties were seen as possibilities. With an enthusiasm, as infectious as fear, they cried, 'Let us go up *at once* and possess it; for we are *well able* to overcome it.'

In all the glorious annals of human history Caleb and Joshua will always deserve fame as men who kept their eyes upon the stars. This hard, matter-of-fact world is often sceptical of star-gazers. Yet we owe everything to this class. These are the men who have maintained an upward, hopeful outlook when others have only seen the mud. Dr. Johnson once said, 'It is worth £1000 a year to have the *habit* of looking on the bright side of things.' Worth £1000 a year! Worth indeed all the wealth of the world! For by these men have the tumults of the world been stilled, the fears of men quietened, and the finest achievements of the race been wrought. Thank God for star-gazers! When others have been complaining, 'We be not able,' these men of vision have cried, 'Forward. We are well able. We shall overcome.'

These, then, are the two fundamental types of men and women. The division is as old as history, and as modern as the present day. They are well known to us all. In the task which God gives to His people in these present days, they stand side by side with us.

We will readily acknowledge that the task given to the Church of Christ to-day is more arduous than the one entrusted to Israel of old. It is no matter of winning a homeland, but of winning a world for our Lord and Saviour. Moreover, we have to win it by better methods than Israel ever knew. This great, bleeding world must be brought to its place of healing in Christ. We must make our own nation, our community, our church, our home, and our hearts the dwelling-places of God.

In proportion as the task is enlarged, so are the difficulties. The walled cities—the entrenched

[1] J. K. Thomson, *I Have Kept the Faith*, 134.

citadels of evil—are still there, stronger and more fortified than ever. The sons of Anak—the mighty ones of evil—still stride the world like a Colossus. 'We are,' as Cromwell wrote to his nephew on the eve of the battle of Dunbar, 'upon an engagement very difficult.'

Need we be surprised, then, that men of fearful heart feel daunted by the task before us? They see only the mud of the campaign; and the soldier who advances eyes downwards never travels far. With sweeping glance they note every obstacle which impedes progress. They point to a divided Christendom, to empty churches, to listless supporters, to militant opposition, and to widespread disregard of God and His demands. All these are over-emphasized and given publicity. Their final verdict reads like a sentence of doom. 'The task is too great; the opposition is too strong; our resources are too small. We are not able; for they are stronger than we.'

But, thank God, we are not without men of vision, those who can see the stars in the dark sky. They know the engagement is 'very difficult.' But like St. Paul they can say, 'I never lose heart. . . . On every side I am harried but not hemmed in, perplexed but not despairing, persecuted but not abandoned, struck down but not destroyed.' They are of the spirit of the great Norwegian, Dr. Nansen, who happily never lived to see the fate of his beloved country. In offering an explanation of his stupendous achievements he said, 'The possible is the thing that can be carried out at once; the impossible is merely the thing that takes a little time.'

If any one should pause to inquire what gives this glorious sense of ability to these men, the answer is very simply stated. In Caleb and Joshua, in St. Paul the Apostle, in Dr. Nansen the explorer and statesman, we see, in different measure, the same thing. We are looking at the *ability of faith.*

Faith, first of all, in ourselves and in our mission. Of what was Caleb thinking when he gave his optimistic (and true) judgment? Was it of the triumphs of Israel's past? After all, these panic-stricken men before him were better than they seemed in that moment of fear. Og, Sihon, and Amalek had all tried their powers against Israel, and in vain. If only they could recover their faith in themselves and their task, Caleb knew they were well able to conquer once more.

Very often the depression and indifference which hangs over so many churches is due to the same cause. We forget, in the struggle of the moment, that we have a glorious past. The ark of our faith has weathered heavier storms than these and come safely through. The Church survived the crash of civilization when the Roman Empire went down in fire and ruin. It survived the upheaval of Reformation times. It came through the stagnation of eighteenth-century England. At the beginning of that century Bishop Butler was bewailing the fact of religion in England being reduced to the level of the ridiculous; at the end of the century the Churches were aflame with the Evangelical Revival. If the biologists are right, and survival is a test of the fittest, the Church of Jesus Christ must be fit for anything. Nothing else could have survived so much.

But, above all, we must have faith in God. 'I can do but little,' said St. Teresa, 'but I with God can do much.'

As Caleb stilled the people, he must have had some inkling of this deeper faith. Had he not seen abundant evidence of the hand of God during their journeyings? He had seen many a deliverance which spoke directly of God's Providence. At that very moment he realized God was still with them. 'Rebel not against the Lord,' he said, 'neither fear ye the people of the land, for they are bread for us; their defence is removed from over them, and the Lord is with us; fear them not.' Because God was there, he knew the seemingly impossible could become possible; as with faith born of a deeper knowledge St. Paul could exclaim, 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.'

When Hudson Taylor sailed for China in 1866, an aged minister wrote to him to say, 'You are making a great mistake in going to China with no organization behind you. We live in a busy world and you will soon be forgotten. The Mission won't last seven years.' Yet at the end of a long and successful life Hudson Taylor could write, 'He has cared for us through all these years. He has graciously helped us. As the work grew, He has given us the organization we had need of, but no place for, at the commencement.'

No one has ever known this better than Charles Wesley. Therefore he has taught us all to sing:

> Faith, mighty faith, the promise sees,
> And looks to that alone;
> Laughs at impossibilities,
> And cries, It shall be done!

With God, we are *well able to overcome* in our day and generation.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

'By these things men live.'

BY THE REVEREND ARCHIBALD CHISHOLM, M.A., D.LITT., GLASGOW.

'I shall go softly all my years.'—Is 38^{15}.

When King Hezekiah had to deal with any great issue he always pursued the same line of action. Outside the gates of the city of Jerusalem a scoffing Assyrian uttered terrifying words and predicted the speedy fall of the besieged town. In the hour of trial, the king covered himself with sackcloth and went into the house of the Lord. At another time, an Ethiopian made stern demands in a document full of threatenings. King Hezekiah went up into the house of the Lord and spread the letter before Him. More peaceful days came, but they brought the king a personal

problem. His bones ached with pain and many hours were spent in agony. It seemed that death was drawing nigh, and yet he was less than forty years of age. In utter sincerity he prayed that his days might be lengthened and uttered the words, 'I have walked before Thee in truth with a perfect heart.' God answered his petition. 'The Lord was ready to save me; therefore we will sing songs all the days of our life in the house of the Lord.'

It is, of course, quite an exceptional experience to be told, as the king was by the prophet, how many years he had to live. To know that fifteen years were granted to him must have been a comfort in a way, but it would be a great trial to know that his days were so exactly numbered. How would we use such borrowed years? In early Israel, one of the simplest measures was that which reaches from the end of the thumb to the end of the little finger—a handbreadth. 'Thou hast made my days as a handbreadth,' says the Psalmist. Threescore years and ten seem to the youth a long time, though they do not seem long to the older man or woman who looks back upon them, but we know that the period of life granted to us has enough time in it for all we are meant to do. 'Are there not twelve hours in the day?' asked Jesus, as with quietness He lived that life which has cast its radiance over the lives of millions of all generations.

Ours is a trying age in which to live. Very heavy demands are made upon all in these days of grim warfare. One writer has described the period in which we live as 'this Neurotic Age,' an age characterized by nervous disorders which very often arise through the inability of men and women to face the exacting demands of life. They have fought a battle which has proved too difficult. For the exacting conditions under which so many live their lives, there is in religion —and I believe only there—a word of hope and strength. Raised up from the illness which all thought would prove fatal, the king looked forward to those fifteen years which he had been granted—those borrowed years—and he said, 'I shall go softly all the days of my life.' What would this mean for us? Just that we should try to find out what are the things in life which really matter, and that with earnestness and confidence in God, we should apply ourselves to those ends. There are many natural and laudable ambitions. We strive for financial security; we aim at an advancement in our calling; we desire comfort for ourselves and those dear to us. We may attain all this and yet miss that which Jesus called the 'pearl of great price.'

There was a king named Agur, whose father taught him many wise lessons, and his prayer is very suitable for us to-day. He saw that some achieved great success whereby they became proud and forgetful of God. Others were cursed by poverty; the iron ate into their souls; they resented their bitter lot; they became rebellious and lost faith in God. 'Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food sufficient for me.' This king, to whom we are introduced in the Proverbs, had discovered what really counted in life. Nothing else was worth while if, in securing it, we lost confidence in a Heavenly Father's love and became estranged from God. 'By these things,' by faith, which means a reliance upon God; by hope, which drives from the future those anxious fears which cause so much tribulation; by love, which enables us to overcome the world; 'by these things men live.' There is the invisible chain which links you in spirit to the Father who slumbers not nor sleeps. He hears your prayer, and discerns the thoughts of every heart. Be brave, live in the faith of our Lord Jesus, and one day you will feel that the days of waiting have not been in vain. There are lessons we can learn, which I am sure you are learning; personality can develop in the hours of testing. Surely this was what the king meant by the word translated in our Authorized Version, 'By these things men live.' By the experience of weakness and pain we can, if we use the opportunity rightly, become braver and more certain of our faith. By our moral failures, if we allow our regret for the past to become a stimulus to nobler striving, we can more adequately lay hold on life. The lesson for all, whether we face disappointment or 'the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,' whether we find the routine of life proving too much, or are subjected to days which seem never to be lacking in their unpleasant surprises, there is nothing which comes to us which we cannot turn to some spirituality. A great and good man who had more than his own share of trial wrote to another who was passing through a time of great trial: 'I do not pray that you may get over your sorrow. Time, I know, will heal—but I pray that you will get into your sorrow and through it, into a deeper faith in God.'

When all goes well, when life spreads before us like a race-track along which we may race unimpaired, it is easy to forget what really counts, but days come, as they did to Hezekiah, when we have an opportunity of quickly reviewing our course. Have we been seeking what is noblest—the glory of God and all that this means? Have we been, to use the king's words, 'going softly?' Or has life been a thoughtless, unconsidered, excited rush, without adequate sense of direction? Perhaps God means some of us to ask ourselves just such a question. It is never too late to start life again, for Jesus who maketh all things new offers to us life, full and enriching.

Is it Possible to Write a Life of Christ?

A Second Answer.

By Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., D.Litt., Oxford.

Historians to-day are in general agreement regarding the methods to be used in the investigation of the past and in their resultant findings, although there always remains some disagreement regarding obscurer questions, due partly to the individual peculiarities of the historians themselves.

It seems strange that, in the investigation of Christian origins, and particularly in that of the life of Jesus, the recognized methods of research have so far secured for us a much smaller measure of agreement than we attain in historical investigation generally. The reason lies, of course, partly in the peculiar character of the available sources, and partly in the far-reaching religious interests felt to be involved. In order to ascertain how far these causes of disagreement can be eliminated, we must go back to first principles.

If 'it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful,' it is required in historians and biographers that a man be found unbiased. This, of course, does not mean that he must come to his task with no presuppositions. Such an approach, even were it possible, would be fruitless. For just as the scientist has to presuppose the uniformity of Nature and the reliability of his methods of observation and inference in order to interpret aright the objective data before him, so the historian, in order to make a right use of the extant records, has to take for granted those broad canons of inherent probability which automatically govern our beliefs about the past, and which no one dreams of challenging outside certain sections of historical theology. Without reliance on such canons of judgment no knowledge of the past would be possible. We have to assume them in dealing with the Synoptic problem: why should we not assume them with equal confidence when we deal with the contents of the story? The assumption is not only not inconsistent with, it is actually demanded by, that reverent docility which is the essential condition for all discovery of the truth. The man who comes to the study of the New Testament with his mind made up against belief in God, and the man who comes to it refusing to assess its evidence according to the normal standards of historical judgment, alike disqualify themselves by their lack of reverence and docility for the task before them.

But reverent docility—apart, of course, from technical competence—is the one thing needful. Whatever theological presuppositions are added to these will tend to hamper the inquirer in his work. However true, for instance, he may feel the Creeds to be, he must not allow them to block his way to a candid treatment of the actual records of our Lord's life.[1] Never was a sounder canon of study laid down than that enunciated in *Lux Mundi* (p. 177) by Dr. R. C. Moberly: 'Councils, we admit, and Creeds, cannot go behind, but must wholly rest upon the history of our Lord Jesus Christ.'[2]

The plea is sometimes advanced that enough has now been done in the way of disentangling the different strata of New Testament thought and literature, and that it is time we concentrated on the unity pervading the whole book. This plea has been supported by the argument that the very attempt to separate a 'bare fact' from the interpretation given to it by those first interested in recording it is in itself illegitimate, that to do so is to deal in abstractions and unrealities, that a true idea should not be 'disengaged from a context with which it forms a living whole,' and so on.[3]

Now, unless I have gravely mistaken the purport of these contentions, I cannot but regard them as erroneous. Attention must, of course, be paid to the religious unity pervading the New Testament, as also to the way in which the first narrators interpreted what actually happened. But it is

[1] I differ here from Dr. Vincent Taylor's words on p. 64a, b of his recent article. Detachment from dogmatic presuppositions does not necessarily involve depicting Jesus as 'a Galilean prophet who never existed'; nor does Schweitzer's plea that Jesus may well have 'thought in terms of doctrine' at all imply that the modern historian ought to settle his Christology before he reconstructs the historical facts about Jesus. The former misconception appears also in Dr. Dodd's *History and the Gospel*, 28 top.

[2] In *The Journal of Religion*, xxi. 22 (Jan. 1941), Dr. D. E. Roberts writes, 'For the Christian his finality and uniqueness do not lie in the historical personality, judged by humanist standards; they lie in the relationship between that historical personality and the divine word incarnate in him.' This seems to me a perversion of the truth, or rather a false antithesis. What do we know about the Incarnation except what we can infer from His recorded history?

[3] C. H. Dodd, *The Present Task of New Testament Studies*, 38, etc. The same idea is advanced in his *History and the Gospel*, 1–38, 103, 110, etc., and in Mr. Alan Richardson's *Miracle-Stories of the Gospels*, 125.

preposterous to demand that we shall accept each such interpretation as the only one possible, or as necessarily true, or as undetachable from the occurrence itself. In no other field of historical inquiry would a reasonable historian consent for a moment to such a rule of procedure.

The familiar differences between the successive Gospel-strata should surely suffice to convince us that, alongside the religious unity characterizing them all, there are also unmistakable differences of interpretation, and that these are often due to the operation of a legendary tendency. This state of affairs surely explodes the idea that it is impossible to get behind certain early traditions about Jesus to the historical reality. The recent so-called 'recoil from historicism,'[1] therefore, so far from being 'salutary,' is a retrograde step, putting us further from the real truth of things.

Let me illustrate my meaning here by reference to miracles. Among the great presuppositions referred to above are (1) the uniformity of Nature, and (2) the tendency, especially among religious Orientals of a pre-scientific age, to produce historically inaccurate narratives of marvellous deeds done by great religious leaders. On the other hand, the historian must remember that marvellous things do happen, and that unprecedented physical results can befall the human body under special psychological conditions, such as the presence of a uniquely gifted personality. The problem therefore is not, Are the Gospel miracles *en masse* credible, or not?, but, Given this or that miracle-story, is it in view of all the relevant considerations more probable that the incident occurred, or that it did not occur? It is here that the evidence itself has to be considered. Now, while all our documents mention the working of healing-miracles by Jesus, the two earliest (Q and L) contain no 'Nature-miracles,' these being first found in Mark, a Gospel written thirty-five to forty years after the supposed occurrences and by one who was not an eye-witness.

Further, a comparison of Mark and Matthew reveals unmistakably the latter's tendency to magnify the range and marvellousness of the incidents: indeed, in the case of at least one miracle (the fig-tree) we can detect a probable source even of the Marcan story in a *parable* recorded by Luke (13^{6-9}). I hold therefore that the most defensible view is (1) to accept the healing-miracles (Matthaean exaggerations and minor Marcan and Lucan perversions apart), and to account for them as due to the psychiatric power with which Jesus was uniquely endowed, and (2) to reject the 'Nature-miracles' as legendary, not because they are inconceivable, but because they are too weakly attested. Such a distinction doubtless owes much to our prior assumption regarding the uniformity of Nature; but it also owes much to the objective condition of the records themselves. And as for our trust in the uniformity of Nature, I would remind the reader that without it we should be powerless to investigate evidence at all.

Much recent criticism, however, ignores these considerations. I am surprised, for instance, that Dr. Rawlinson, in his otherwise excellent commentary on Mark, repeatedly frowns on any strict investigation into the facts behind the Marcan miracle-stories, on the ground that the attempt is 'wholly foreign to the standpoint of antiquity' and 'is to miss the point of their purpose' (p. 59; cf. 60, 84 f., 88; similarly on healings, pp. 68, 70; on the empty grave, p. 243 ['. . . utterly foreign to the spirit of the narrative']). But what if it is? Why must the modern Christian never take a step beyond the limits observed by the Synoptists and their first readers? The embargo seems to me utterly arbitrary. The Rev. Alan Richardson's book, *The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels* (1941), is a still more provocative version of the same plea. For him the issue really turns, not on historical evidence, but on Christian faith. His attitude seems to me to be vitiated by its unscientific preference for dogma to evidence as a ground for reconstructing the past, its assumption that the Evangelists' interpretation must determine our own, and its disregard of the differing value of the various records.

While the Synoptic Gospels form a class by themselves as our primary sources, it would be a grave error to ignore those secondary sources furnished by the rest of the New Testament and other early Christian literature. Whatever the Synoptic record says or does not say about Jesus, it remains true that He was at least great and wonderful enough for these secondary sources to have said of Him what they did say; and our reconstruction must allow sufficiently for that startling fact. I want only to utter a warning against reading back into the Synoptic record features suggested by later portrayals of the glorified Christ, but either unsupported by that earlier record or perhaps inconsistent with it. It is not for us to say *a priori* how much human limitation is compatible with Jesus' Divine Saviourhood; that is exactly what we have to allow the records as they stand to teach us.

The widespread lukewarmness, or indeed antagonism, to the general principles advocated in this essay is connected with a desire to discredit the 'liberal' treatment of the Gospel-records in the interests of a less sceptical and more dogmatic attitude to them. But the same principles seem to me to be equally antagonistic to another

[1] Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, 11–14.

modern attitude—that of the Form-critics. While these latter are historically far more sceptical than the liberals, they are—strangely enough—often far nearer the dogmatic position held by most conservatives. I take my stand with those who are profoundly dubious of the value of Form-criticism. No doubt it is good to be reminded that there is a dogmatic element present in Mark; no doubt the questions put by Form-critics about the growth of the tradition between A.D. 30 and A.D. 65 are relevant, interesting, and (if we knew the answers to them) important; no doubt Church-conditions helped to mould what was remembered and reported about Jesus—so that scholars must use the Gospel-materials with great caution and patience. But all this was known before, and large allowance was made for it. Form-critics constantly assume that we know far more than we really do about the early Christian use and treatment of the tradition; they widely disagree with one another as to the conclusions attainable by their methods; and many of them are extremely sceptical as to the historical value of the Gospel-narrative, in consequence of their erroneous assumption that most of the story was framed by the Early Church in order to provide an ostensible authority for her own guidance. Thus Form-criticism has not carried us more than a very little way beyond the point we were already able to reach by means of a careful comparative use of the documents, as these had been disentangled and elucidated for us by scholars like B. H. Streeter, Vincent Taylor, and T. W. Manson. Moreover, it lies open to suspicion when we find it being used mainly for the purpose of discrediting liberalism and commending conservative and particularly Barthian views.

So much for general principles. A word or two may now be added on a few of the special questions involved.

I do not think the Johannine discourses can be treated as reports of Jesus' teaching in at all the same sense as can the Synoptic sayings.[1] But I regard the *narrative* of the Fourth Gospel as resting on very early evidence, and as a valuable supplement to the Synoptic story.

Concerning eschatology, it seems to me a mistake for conservative theologians to praise Schweitzer so warmly for having at least demolished the liberal picture of Jesus.[2] He did indeed repudiate that liberal picture, but only to replace it by the figure of a deluded eschatological fanatic, historically far less real than the liberal Jesus and much further removed from the Christ of traditional faith. I doubt the legitimacy of thus applauding his negative results, if one means to reject all his positive ones. The utmost service his eschatologism can be said to have rendered is that he convinced scholars that Jesus' eschatology must be taken seriously and that the liberal picture was defective in so drastically transmuting it. But that transmutation was based on the assumption (which conservatives surely should welcome) that Jesus could have entertained no expectations that were not justified by subsequent events. When we do take his eschatology seriously, as anti-liberal eulogists of Schweitzer urge that we must, we find ourselves faced with two extremely awkward problems—the intellectual limitations of Jesus, and the religious value of an at least partly erroneous eschatology. I cannot discuss these problems here; but I would observe that they are the inevitable aftermath of Schweitzer's kind deliverance of us from the dreadful curse of 'liberalism.'

We do not possess for the life of Jesus anything approaching that knowledge of chronology which is usually deemed necessary for a 'biography.' Yet we are not so much at sea in this matter as is often assumed. While it must remain for ever impossible to arrange the several Gospel episodes in a reliable order, there is nothing to prevent us grouping them in a series of clusters which will correspond, at least roughly, to the actual sequence in which they occurred.

Jesus' mission was world-wide and eternal in its significance. But its actual features were shaped by the historical and local situation in which He found Himself. That speciality should help us to see that, at the beginning of His ministry, He expected, not repudiation and death, but acceptance and loyalty from His people, and that He interested Himself deeply in the possibility of a reconciliation between Israel and the Gentile world.

Summing up, then, I do not concur in the modern view that it is impossible to write a life of Christ, though I recognize that any such life must suffer from the limitation and peculiar character of the records. I have tried to indicate the principles on which the work ought to be undertaken. If such a life is ever written, it will inevitably bring with it a few painful surprises; but these will be more than off-set by the added clearness with which we shall see the real Jesus. For the more clearly and exactly we can come to know Him the more deeply are we likely to be touched and changed by His saving power.

[1] I agree with Dr. Vincent Taylor (pp. 62 f.) that these sayings cannot be neglected; but I could not deny so confidently as he does that they are the free compositions of the Evangelist. I should not regard them as on the whole nearer to what Jesus actually said than Plato's *Dialogues* are to what Socrates actually said.

[2] See, for instance, the editorial remarks in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlviii. 148 f. (Jan. 1937) and lii. 322 f. (June 1941).

Further Evidence for Indications of the Johannine Chronology of the Passion to be Found in the Synoptic Evangelists.

By the Reverend R. P. C. Hanson, B.D., Dublin.

It is now, I think, a fact generally recognized among scholars that the Gospels present us with two different, and irreconcilable, chronologies of the events which constituted our Lord's Passion, one, the Johannine (whose main source is the Fourth Gospel), placing the Last Supper, Crucifixion, and Burial on Nisan 14 (reckoning this day, of course, from sunset to sunset), the day called 'The Preparation of the Passover,' and the other, the Marcan (whose main source is the Second Gospel), placing these events on Nisan 15, the Passover Day itself, otherwise known as the First Day of Unleavened Bread, though they both agree that Our Lord was crucified on a day before a Sabbath. But it has also been suggested that indications of a Johannine chronology can be found in the Synoptic Gospels, and notably in Mk 14^{1-2} and in the special, un-Marcan, source which probably lies behind Luke's account of the Last Supper (Lk 22^{14-38}). The purpose of this article is to suggest two more points which, though not by themselves very cogent, yet add some weight to the theory that evidence for the Johannine chronology of the Passion is not confined to the Fourth Gospel.

1. An analysis of Luke's account of the Last Supper (such as that conducted by Vincent Taylor in ch. 2 of *Behind the Third Gospel*), and particularly of Lk 22^{14-18}, will show that there is a strong case to be made for the theory that in Luke's special source for this account (and probably therefore for his whole Passion-narrative) the Last Supper was not placed on the night of the Passover Meal (Nisan 15) but on the previous night (Nisan 14). There is another passage in Luke which seems to fit in better with this indication of a Johannine chronology of the Passion than with the Marcan chronology. Lk 23^{54-56} reads, 'And it was the day of Preparation, and the Sabbath was drawing on, and the women, who had come with him out of Galilee, followed after and beheld the tomb, and how his body was placed. And returning they prepared spices and myrrh.' Mark in the parallel passage (Mk 15^{47}–16^{1}) tells us that the women only bought spices *after* the Sabbath Day; Vincent Taylor believes that for the whole passage (Lk 23^{55}–24^{1}) the Evangelist was relying chiefly on his special, un-Marcan source, and says (*op. cit.*, ch. 2), 'On a careful review of the whole question, our conclusion can only be . . . that his difference from Mark in respect of the women's action is due, not to any modification of Mark, but to his possession of, and preference for, an independent source.' Now, if we follow Mark's account of the action of the women, we will find it quite consistent with the Marcan chronology; the women waited till the Sabbath which followed the Passover Day was over, and then bought spices. But if we try to make sense of Luke's account of their action and still retain the Marcan chronology we will find ourselves in difficulties at once; how can we imagine that the women could have been able to buy spices *on the Day of the Passover itself*, the great day of the festival when work would be less likely to be in progress or goods for sale than almost on any day of the year? But this, if we apply Mark's chronology to this passage in Luke, is what the passage implies. But we need not apply the Marcan chronology of the Passion to this passage; it may well derive from Luke's special source; if we apply to it the chronology which this special source seems to have followed —the Johannine—we will find the women's action much easier to explain; it was not during the last hours of the Passover Day that the women bought the spices, but during the last hours of the day before that, the Day of Preparation. We can well imagine that the author of Luke's special source may have thought this a natural time to buy spices, whether his account of the action or Mark's be the more correct; he could hardly have thought the last hours of the Passover Day to be a natural time. Here is therefore another small piece of evidence for a Johannine chronology to be found in the Synoptic Gospels.

2. The next point is concerned with the word παρασκευή. Here we must first establish the meaning which this word has in the Fourth Gospel, and then see how the word is used by the Synoptic Evangelists. Bauer, in his *Griechisch-Deutches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*,

makes it clear that the word has two meanings, an ordinary Friday of Preparation before an ordinary Sabbath, and the special day of preparation before a festival; whether this latter meaning also must imply a Friday is not certain and is not relevant to the point. The word occurs only six times in the whole New Testament, all in the Passion-Narratives of the Evangelists; three of these occur in the Fourth Gospel, all in ch. 19. Verse [14] of this chapter runs: ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα (telling us the day and time of Pilate's leading Jesus on to the 'Pavement'). Now there is, of course, no doubt which meaning is to be attached to the word in this context; it means 'the day before the Passover Day' here and can mean nothing else; it is important to note the meaning of this, the first use the Evangelist has made of the word. The next use is in verse [31]: οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν, ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ (ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου), ἠρώτησαν, κ.τ.λ. Now we must naturally assume that if the first mention of the words παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα means 'the Day of Preparation for the Passover,' the next mention of παρασκευή alone, seventeen verses later, would mean exactly the same thing, unless the writer tells us to the contrary. At first, however, we do seem to be told to the contrary, for the phrase ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ seems to explain ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν, in which case παρασκευή would probably mean only 'the day before the sabbath' and have no reference to the festival of the Passover. But this is only a superficial reading of the passage, because, apart from the fact that to omit mention of the Passover Day in this context would be very strange, this leaves out of account the sentence in parenthesis, ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου. Now the word in this sentence which needs most explanation is γάρ, because the statement that 'the day of that Sabbath was a high day' does not follow naturally on from, or explain, the statement that the Jews were anxious to prevent the bodies remaining on the Cross during a Sabbath; if we believe that the sentence in parenthesis explains the clause which it immediately follows, we must mistranslate it, 'for the day of that high day was a sabbath.' On the other hand, to say that the day of that Sabbath was a high day does admirably explain the clause which comes shortly before these words, viz. ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν; it was the day of preparation for the Passover, because the day on which that Sabbath fell was the high day. It is significant that the Textus Receptus places ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν immediately before the sentence in parenthesis, significant not as pointing to the original reading, but as suggesting that others found our interpretation of the meaning of the text satisfactory enough to adjust the text to suit their interpretation better. It seems on the whole most satisfactory, then, to link the sentence in parenthesis with the clause ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν and thereby show that, as we found to be *a priori* likely, the writer is referring to the Day of Preparation before the Passover and not to an ordinary Friday. The next mention of the word, the last made in the Fourth Gospel, is in the account of the Burial; verse [42] says: ἐκεῖ οὖν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον, ἔθηκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. It might be argued that the writer of the Gospel here must be referring to an ordinary Friday without thinking of the Passover since he says 'because of the Jews' Preparation,' presumably contrasting it with the Christians' Preparation, which would be Saturday; but there is no evidence that the Early Church ever called Saturday the παρασκευή; on the contrary, we find (according to Bauer, *op. cit.*) in the *Didache* viii, 1, and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, vii, 1, the word παρασκευή used meaning Friday, the day on which our Lord was crucified. This contention must be outweighed by the likelihood that the writer, having used the word twice already in the same chapter, on each occasion intending as far as we can see the Day of Preparation for the Passover, would attach precisely the same meaning to the word when he used it eleven verses later, unless he gave some other indication of a different use. It is certain, then, that the author of St. John's Gospel in his use of the word παρασκευή in the first instance means 'the Day of preparation for the Passover,' and very probable that in the other two instances he means precisely the same thing.

We now turn to the use of the word by the Synoptic Evangelists. They each use it once only, all in very nearly the same context; this is of course because the First and Third Evangelists derive their contexts from Mark. These are the passages concerned:

Mk 15[42]: καὶ ἤδη ὀψίας γενομένης ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὅ ἐστιν προσάββατον, ἐλθὼν Ἰωσήφ, κ.τ.λ.

Lk 23[54]: καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε.

Mt 27[62]: τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἥτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν, συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.

Now it is noticeable that none of the Synoptic Evangelists says directly and immediately

that Jesus was buried 'on the day before the "sabbath"; they all use the word παρασκευή and then connect it with the Sabbath; Mark of course most directly saying ὅ ἐστιν προσάββατον. Of this phrase Loisy remarks that it 'vient comme un surcharge' and calls it a 'glose,' and we can certainly agree that 'which is the-day-before-the-sabbath' looks very like an explanation by Mark of a word which he found in his source, and suggests a desire to edit this source in accordance with the view of the chronology of the Passion which Mark had adopted. Luke's 'and it was the day of Preparation, and the sabbath drew on' is again not altogether straightforward; if we take παρασκευή as meaning only 'the day before the Sabbath,' it is obviously tautologous to say 'and it was the day before the Sabbath, and the Sabbath drew on.' But Matthew's phrase, 'on the morrow, which is the day after the Preparation,' is very perplexing. Loisy calls it a 'formule bizarre,' and thinks that it arises from a desire to include Mark's reference to the Preparation, even though late. Matthew does not immediately connect this παρασκευή with the Sabbath, but his phrase ὀψὲ τῶν σαββάτων in 28[1], makes it clear that he does not desert the Marcan chronology in this particular; his phrase, 'the day after the Preparation,' does not so much suggest a confused reminiscence of Mark as a desire to include παρασκευή without knowing exactly what meaning to attach to it. In fact, we may say that this examination of the Synoptists' use of the word παρασκευή has suggested that all of them, even Mark, are anxious to mention the word, whether they explain it directly (as Mark does) or indirectly (as Luke does), in a context where the use of the word was by no means necessary to indicate the particular day they were referring to, that is, the day before the Sabbath.

Scholars have attempted to account for the divergence between the two chronologies of the Passion found in the Gospels by supposing that the Evangelists confused the ordinary weekly Preparation for the Sabbath and the yearly Preparation for the Passover; now we have found no reason to assume this confusion in the mind of the author of the Fourth Gospel, but it may have influenced the Synoptic Evangelists in their treatment of the word παρασκευή. Again, others, arguing against Mark's chronology of the Passion, have suggested that the feast-day, on which our Lord according to Mark was crucified and buried, would not have been called simply 'Preparation.' This is important for our point; Mark and Luke tell us that the Burial took place on the day of Preparation, connecting it with the Sabbath; Matthew tells us that the sealing of the Tomb took place on the day after this day (which he too calls the day of Preparation). Why do they all use this term 'the day of Preparation' to describe this day? Surely it is a very inadequate way of describing the Passover day merely to call it 'the Friday'; it might be argued that they all use this term in order to show that the next day was a Sabbath, and that therefore the bodies could not be left on the Cross; but we can readily answer this by saying that in the first place one of the Synoptists (Matthew) does not connect the term with a reference to the Sabbath, and secondly, that if the bodies had been allowed to hang on the Cross during the Passover day (one of the most important festivals of the Jewish year) it would have been a matter of small consequence had they been allowed to continue there for an ordinary Sabbath. I suggest that the best answer to these questions is, that among his sources Mark found a tradition that Jesus was buried on the παρασκευή, meaning the day before the Passover, not merely the day before the Sabbath; that Mark interpreted this as meaning only the day before the Sabbath, though he retained the word given in his source, adding an explanatory sentence himself; that the other Synoptists implied, but did not directly adopt, the same interpretation, and were sufficiently uncertain of the real meaning of the word to use the word itself, inserting it rather as a part of their tradition than as a help to the chronology of their narratives. This theory, in short, sees behind the Synoptists' use of the word παρασκευή another piece of evidence that their sources contained material which followed a Johannine chronology of the Passion, because it seeks to show that the word had in their sources the same meaning as it had in the Fourth Gospel—the day of the Preparation of the Passover.

Contributions and Comments.

'An Evil Eye' (Mark vii. 22).

In August, 1864, Parson Hawker of Morwenstow, the eccentric Devonshire cleric, wrote to a friend, 'The Evil Eye is again at work here. One of my ewes died yesterday and the ram is taken ill.' He thought that some one who had the Evil Eye had, in the literal sense, 'overlooked' his sheep and brought a curse upon them! Nor is this belief yet extinct in the British Isles. Elsewhere it is very much alive. If, for instance, some one who is reputed to have the Evil Eye walks along a crowded street in Naples, the people run as if from a bomb. In Morocco there is a saying that the Evil Eye 'owns two-thirds of the burial-ground.' Sometimes it is thought that people have it in spite of themselves, and there is record of a poor fellow in Poland who blinded himself lest his Evil Eye should harm his neighbours. The brass ornaments on a horse's harness used not to be ornaments at all, but charms against the Evil Eye. Sometimes there has been a tendency to ascribe it to parsons in general and Popes in particular! In brief, the belief in the Evil Eye is one of the oldest and widest-spread ideas in the world.[1] What does the Bible do with it?

The Old Testament begins to 'moralize' the idea. It knows nothing, for instance, of an involuntary 'evil eye.' The Book of Proverbs, for instance, warns men against accepting an invitation to dinner when the would-be host hopes to get something out of his guest when he has feasted him—a practice that is not extinct (Pr 23^6). The Book of Deuteronomy has a horrible picture of a man in a beleaguered and famine-stricken city. He is reduced to cannibalism, and is eating a child's body, but he has an Evil Eye for his own wife if she wants to share his meal (Dt $28^{54ff.}$). Yet perhaps the most significant passage is the text, 'Saul *eyed* David from that day and forward' ($1\ S\ 18^9$). This text illustrates the strange fact that no people seems to have thought or talked of a Good Eye. To 'eye' a man is to wish him evil. In other words, the Old Testament means by an Evil Eye an evil *motive*. Men are past masters in hiding motives, but they find it hardest to keep them out of their eyes. It was enough to look at Saul when *he* was looking at David.

But what did Jesus do with the idea of the Evil Eye? If His use of it in the Parable of the Labourers is noted, it is plain that He used it to denote an evil motive, and the motive of envy in particular. The labourers were day-labourers, and they lived each day on their earnings the day before. The householder, knowing that all of them had been *willing* to work, though some had not had the opportunity until the 'eleventh hour,' gave them all what they *needed*. In other words, Jesus anticipated the idea, which Christendom is only now beginning to reach, that a man who is willing to work ought to be paid, not according to what he may have 'earned,' but according to what he needs. One of those who had worked twelve hours objected, as most people object now—'Well, but he has not earned as much as I have!' The householder replied, 'Is thine eye evil then?' The man was 'murmuring,' or 'grousing' as we say, because his neighbour too was to have enough to eat the next day.

But Jesus did far more than repeat the Old Testament idea that the Evil Eye stands for an evil motive. He revolutionized the whole concept. He said, 'If *thine* eye be evil, *thy* whole body shall be full of darkness' (Mt $6^{22f.}$). In other words, if a man has an Evil Eye, it does not inevitably harm some one else, as all the world has thought, but the *man himself*. The rest of the passage expounds this idea. 'The lamp of the body is the eye'—that is, since the 'body' is our means of action, 'Your motive decides the quality of your whole way of life.' 'If thine eye be single, *thy* whole body shall be full of light,'—that is, 'The good motive makes a good man.' On the other hand, an evil motive fills a man's life with a 'darkness' that is immeasurable. His hand fumbles, his foot stumbles, his ear does not know how to sift what it hears, his tongue inevitably twists the truth. We may say of motive what our fathers said of 'manners,'—motive 'makes the man.' Just as Jesus uses here the figure of 'darkness,' in Mark $7^{20ff.}$. He uses that of dirt—'From within, out of the heart of men' there 'proceeds' an 'evil eye,' and this '*defiles* the man.' Burns uses yet another figure. He says of sin that it '*hardens* a' within, and petrifies the feeling.' Evil motive is a moral boomerang. It blinds and dirties and hardens, not others, but the man himself.

Jesus made a second original contribution to the subject. He set the 'good eye' over against the 'evil eye.' Yet He did not use the phrase 'good eye,' but 'single eye.' So far as can be traced, this striking phrase was of His own coining. When He made it, He was warning men against double motives. The context of the passage in Matthew shows that He was not just referring to bad motives, but to a wrong relation among good motives. He was speaking about the bread-and-butter question—'What shall I eat? What shall I drink?'—that continually intrudes on men's lives, especially in time of war. He says, in effect, that this motive, like all other good ones, must be subordinated to a 'single' motive—to 'seek the Kingdom of God.' If it is not so subordinated, it puts a man's eye out of focus, and he sees double. Indeed, innocent as his life may look, he is trying to serve 'God and Mammon,' and this cannot be. Even the earning of daily bread must not interfere with a man's single-minded and whole-hearted service of God. The latter must engross the whole

[1] See the article in the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, from which these instances are taken.

of life, that so a man's 'whole body' may be 'full of light.' If Jesus had not so lived Himself, He would have had somewhere to 'lay His head.' Every one knows that if a man has 'a single eye' he carries light with him into any company. Jesus said to His disciples, '*Ye* are the light of the world.'

It would be easy to show that Jesus' other words about the 'eye' and 'light' all fall into line with this. For instance, it would sometimes happen in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth that a tiny splinter from the axe or the saw would leap into Joseph's or Jesus' eye and the other would carefully take it away. But both would have laughed at the suggestion that a man might have a 'beam' in his eye! But what is impossible physically may happen spiritually. The censorious man is just a man with a 'beam' in his eye. In the Fourth Gospel the fault of 'the Jews,' when they dispute with Jesus, is just that their true motive was not to seek the glory of Jehovah but somehow to evade the challenge that Jesus made against their kind of 'righteousness.' Only one example out of several can be given. 'This is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil. . . . But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light' (Jn $3^{19.\ 21}$). People to-day give all sorts of reasons for refusing to follow Jesus, but the commonest real reason is still the same. They have not a 'single eye.' If they have, they say with Charles Wesley:

Jesus, my single eye,
Be fixed on Thee alone.

But who can change his own motives? What is a man to do who is blind? 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because . . . He hath sent Me to proclaim . . . recovering of sight to the blind.' The late Dr. Charles Wenyon was the first medical missionary in a Chinese city. He let it be known that he was a doctor and waited for patients. Certain young fellows amused themselves by bringing to his door all sorts of hopeless 'cases.' He still went on waiting. Then one day they brought him a blind beggar, who had long frequented the market-place. Wenyon examined his eyes and saw that he had cataract in its advanced stage. He said quietly, 'Leave him for a while.' The day came when the man ran into the market-place crying 'I can see! I can see!' Jesus is used to doing that kind of miracle for blind souls, and His door is open.

People who come to church but do not 'confess Christ' are not altogether blind. Might we say that they are more like moles than bats? There was once a lady who had lived for more than twenty years with a sort of impression that she did not see as she ought to see. At last she consulted an 'eye specialist.' He examined her eyes carefully; then he went and curled himself up on a couch with a quiet and happy smile. 'Mrs. ——,' he said, 'You have never seen yet as you ought to have seen; I can make you see.' And he did. Then, for instance, for the first time in her life, she saw that the stars are not just a bright smudge, but—stars. Jesus waits to do this kind of miracle too, for those who 'ask Him.'

C. Ryder Smith.

St. Albans.

The Umbrella of the Almighty.

It was after I had spent six or seven years on the Western Canadian prairies and was somewhat inured to their climatic moods that I had an experience of the tremendous 'act of God' that a hailstorm can be. On a hot Saturday afternoon in July, while engrossed in putting the last paragraphs to the morrow's sermon, the storm silently gathered, and broke with awful din and blackness, and devastation. It was startling to see the first hailstones arrive, bouncing on the ground like small-sized golf balls. Then an avalanche of them, driven by a hurricane, smashed the windows exposed, hammered the walls with dents that remained, destroyed gardens, crops, domestic fowls, and birds, in that village and over a strip of country. It was soon past. In less than ten minutes the wind had ceased and the sun was shining. One had to sweep up broken glass and hailstones that were turning into floods of water.

On the day following few of the congregation were in church. They were recovering from the disaster, clearing up wreckage and getting over the shock. To lose the proceeds of a year in a few minutes is a jolt.

On my Sunday's round I dropped in upon a Mennonite family with whom, despite the language barrier, I had had happy fellowship. At his gate the man of the place greeted me. 'Are you hailed out too?' I asked. 'Yes,' said he; and pointed to buildings, gardens, and fields. Then he added: 'We are not hailed out in here,' pointing to his breast. In the house the family and a few others gathered around the kitchen table. I read the 91st Psalm: 'He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.' Then I paused. One of the men had his German Bible open at my elbow; and I glanced at it. I knew less of German than he knew of English, but the word which took the place of 'shadow' in the English was 'Schirm.' So I asked, 'What word in everyday English would you use for "Schirm"?' There was a consultation in which four or five men and women took part. Then a young man gave answer: 'Umbrella.' That is what the psalmist's words meant to them: 'under the umbrella of the Almighty.'

So I went home through a desolate country with a new thought about God and the storm. Tempests and all calamities have their use. A friend's umbrella which he shares with me in the day of rain is more than a shelter. 'Under the umbrella of the Almighty' there is more than 'shadow.'

I feel His presence, His strong arm, His shoulder,
His stride, and the eternal purpose of Him.

A. E. Millson.

Windsor, Ontario.

Entre Nous.

'The Expository Times.'

The Editors will be glad to have further opinions from readers on the experiments in type now being tried.

Quotations.

'To make Dictionaries is dull work,' Samuel Johnson wrote.

However this may have been in the case of his 'Dictionary of the English Language,' it must surely have been otherwise with *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* (25s. net). This, the latest addition to the Oxford University Press's valuable books of reference, must surely have been as entrancing and absorbing to compile as it is to read.

The scope of the work is wide. The quotations number about 40,000 and occupy 1150 columns of text. The test for admission is familiarity. Fifty-six columns are required for the Bible and twenty-eight for the Book of Common Prayer. The excellent index contains about 80,000 entries, or two key words for every quotation. With their aid it should not be difficult to track down the illusive phrase.

In view of the high standard it would be ungenerous to draw attention to errors, of which indeed we might say we have found very few. One quotation is puzzling; are the compilers correct in attributing to Rhodes words which come from 'In Memoriam' because he inverted the order of phrases? It will be remembered that Rhodes' last words were 'So little done, so much to do.' In Tennyson the lines run:

> 'So many worlds, so much to do,
> So little done, such things to be.'

Some omissions are puzzling. It is surprising to find that Churchill, for example, who has given so many immortal quotations to the present hour, is represented only by one made from a speech in 1906.

Apart from its usefulness *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* contains infinite possibilities of entertainment. There is a fascination about reading it as an anthology. Mr. Bernard Darwin, who contributes an informative and withal amusing introduction, suggests that readers may engage in heated quoting matches and that devotees of Crossword Puzzles will find the volume a boon. Our particular diversion has been to look for quotations apt in the conditions of to-day. There are a surprising number, but we have space for only a bare half dozen.

An Englishman whose heart is in a matter is not easily baffled.
(Walter Bagehot: *The Monarchy.*)

She help'd him to lean, and she help'd him to fat,
And it look'd like hare—but it might have been cat.
(R. H. Barham: *The Bagman's Dog.*)

That
Sheep-worry of Europe [Napoleon].
(Robert Bridges: *Wintry Delights.*)

The rule is, jam to-morrow and jam yesterday—but never jam to-day. (Lewis Carroll: *The Walrus and the Carpenter.*)

But the cup is nearly full. The career of high-handed wrong is coming to an end. (Joseph Chamberlain: *Speech*, 1884.)

The sweet simplicity of the three per cents. (Disraeli: *Endymion.*)

A United Front.

'The enmity between first cousins is the hardest to eradicate.' 'I first heard this South Indian proverb,' says the President of Cheshunt College, 'from the lips of Azariah, Bishop of Dornakal, at the Edinburgh Conference four years ago, when he was making an impassioned appeal for Christian unity. . . . Our unhappy divisions present us all with an issue which is even more urgent than it was four years ago, when that speech of Bishop Azariah described the Church in India as "face to face with giant non-Christian forces." He might have been making a prophetic comment on our own immediate situation; for we see the Christian Church everywhere fighting for its very life against secularism and downright paganism. . . . While the Churches are cautiously manœuvring for their new approach to the old and now urgent problem of religious education in the schools of the nation, powerful and frankly irreligious forces threaten all such education with total abolition. In short, we are confronted with a new religious situation in England; one which has had no parallel here for several centuries.'[1]

Margery Allingham.

To the question which are the two best-known women writers of detective fiction the well-nigh unanimous answer would be Dorothy Sayers and Margery Allingham. It is interesting and curious to notice that lately both have gone outside the sphere they had made their own. In *The Oaken Heart* Margery Allingham quits the crime story, and successful as she was in the latter she has gained an equal, if not greater, success in this

[1] John S. Whale, in *The Christian World*, 4th Dec. 1941.

picture of a war-time English village. It will remain when many more sentimental and emotional contemporary descriptions are forgotten. We give two short quotations, the first on religious teaching in the village school, and the second on freedom.

The Village School.

'Auburn felt strongly about the school. . . . It was built by public subscription in Auburn, and generations of Auburn people have learnt to read and write and add there. Moreover, what is highly important, they have also had a little religious instruction there, since it is a Church School and not one of the new-fangled places who, in order to avoid interdenominational strife, have thrown away the baby with the bath water and done away with the Catechism and the Ten Commandments altogether.

'In common with most of my generation I would blush to call myself deeply religious, but I do find it odd that as a nation we will fight and die for principles which we cannot find time to teach in our free schools. . . .

'The school was marked for closing. Auburn's reaction was prompt and indignant. It was the same sort of reaction which you might get if you took a very old hat away from a dotard snoozing in the sun, with a brisk "You don't need that any more, do you, Grandpa? Here comes the salvage van."

'It was in many ways a remarkable and even an epic struggle lasting for the best part of two years. . . . Finally the closing order was rescinded at the eleventh hour and the school remains—small, obsolete, and remarkably if obscurely useful.' [1]

On Freedom.

'Suppose down the road and out of the sky the thick grey men come swarming on us. What then? *Give me time and I'll pay the National Debt. Be a bundle of sticks. . . . He'll break his teeth on England. Courage is vital but not enough. Work for the freedom which means life. Pray for it, fight for it, die for it if you have to, live for it if you can. It's worth it.*

'That's my contribution to the little family store of conviction. After a lifetime of "*It's all very difficult*" I can now say honestly, "*It's worth it*" and "*I wouldn't be dead for a pound.*"

'The conviction is mine but the seed of it is Auburn's. . . .

'With the rest of Auburn and the thousands of villages like us I have found something out, and there is a rock under my feet. Physical fear, recantations under torture are weapons of the enemy. *They are not truths.* If we are not free to-morrow, we shall not be happy to-morrow. There will be no living in false content. That in all the world is certain. We have touched something solid and eternal after floundering for a generation in a sea of muddles and unsatisfying things. Whatever comes after, we have got back something vital which had been lost. With it you live always; without it you die.' [2]

[1] *The Oaken Heart*, 13.

Going On.

'I knew a woman in the Isles. I recall her at this moment with a certain thankfulness of pride. For it was a privilege to know her. Upon a summer's eve some of us, her friends, talked with her. We were speaking of heroism and about how the most prosaic of us must practise some form of it. A young man turned to her curiously. "And what form do you practise?" he said. A sudden silence fell upon the room. Through the open window, at which she stood, came floating in the scent of wild violets and the ancient lullaby of the sea. Then she turned and answered. Her cry still rings through the chamber of my soul, a cry that sprang from her bleeding heart, but with a thousand trumpets in every note of it. "I will tell you that," she flamed, "I will tell you that. I practise the heroism of going on.'" [3]

Worry.

'One of the commonest of all delusions is that you have done something towards conquering a difficulty when you have worried about it.' [4]

Tremendous Trifles.

'Cecil Spring Rice, then a secretary at the British Legation, was always ready to entertain an audience with humorous anecdotes of his adventures. Once, after carrying dispatch bags to Paris, he had sent in an expense sheet to the Foreign Office which included one shilling each for cab and porter. The latter item had been disallowed by the auditor on the ground that Her Majesty's servants while on duty were not permitted to include charges for alcoholic beverages. Spring Rice had written to explain that "porter" did not refer to malt liquor but to the individual who conveyed his bags from the train to the cab. He would be glad to revise the entry if the auditor would inform him of the correct term. In due course a reply arrived advising him the word should be "porterage."

'Spring Rice thereupon amended his statement,

To porterage . . one shilling
To cabbage . . one shilling

'The account was approved.' [5]

[2] *The Oaken Heart*, 274.

[3] A. Maclean, *The Quiet Heart*, 57. (This is not a new book, but the quotation is so timely, that we give it.—Ed.)

[4] Ezra, in *The Methodist Recorder*.

[5] Lloyd C. Griscom, *Diplomatically Speaking*, 16.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.